



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2022

No. 24

## House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of Maryland).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
February 7, 2022.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ANTHONY G. BROWN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 10, 2022, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

### CONGRESS MUST END THE FENTANYL CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. STEIL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEIL. Mr. Speaker, 64,000 Americans died from fentanyl and its analogs in a recent 12-month period. It is the leading cause of death in the United States for individuals aged 18 to 45. Fentanyl has killed more people aged 18 to 45 than car accidents, than suicide, than COVID. Again, it killed 64,000 Americans in a 12-month period.

I recently spoke to two parents who lost a child to fentanyl.

Congress must act.

What is fentanyl? Fentanyl and fentanyl analogs are synthetic opioids that have a real risk of abuse and dependence. It is an unusually dangerous and an unusually deadly drug, and many of the victims are not even aware they are taking it.

Where are the drugs coming from? This drug is often manufactured in high quantities in China and is pouring across our southern border. And it is getting worse.

Last year, fentanyl seizures across our southern border increased by over 1,000 percent. Border agents captured 588 pounds of this drug. To conceptualize that, that is enough to kill 133 million Americans.

I have been to the southern border, and I have spoken firsthand to the men and women of Border Protection about the increased drugs coming across our southern border.

We must secure our border. We cannot stand by and watch as Americans are killed by fentanyl and its analogs.

We should continue to be focused on limiting the flow of fentanyl coming into our country. We should be raising awareness of the lethal effects of fentanyl. We should be helping local law enforcement and our first responders work to address this crisis.

In 11 days, fentanyl analogs and related substances will no longer be a schedule I drug. The fentanyl analogs schedule I status expires on February 18, in 11 days.

Congress previously kicked the can down the road and temporarily extended fentanyl analogs as a schedule I drug last May, but that expires in 11 days.

If fentanyl analogs are not extended or made permanent soon, law enforcement officers will have a hand tied behind their back from stopping fentanyl from killing Americans.

Yet Speaker PELOSI continues to refuse to bring the HALT Act, critical

legislation, to this floor to make scheduling permanent. We need to make scheduling fentanyl analogs permanent.

I call upon my fellow Members of Congress to help us end the fentanyl crisis.

### RUNAWAY INFLATION IS HURTING EVERY HOUSEHOLD IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to once again address the crisis hurting every household in America: runaway inflation.

The January 12 Consumer Price Index report showed inflation has increased 7 percent over the last 12 months, the fastest increase since 1982.

Rural communities are being hit harder than anyone else. In my district, inflation has increased 8 percent over the past year. Americans are paying more for essentials everywhere, from the grocery store to the gas station, and working families are being hit the hardest.

Like many of my colleagues, I believe the primary driver of this inflation is unchecked government spending. Unfortunately, even though inflation has reached historic highs, this issue continues to be ignored by many of my Democrat colleagues.

Whether you agree with me or not, we owe it to the American people to identify the root cause and begin to address the problem. I have introduced legislation to do just that, and I hope all of my colleagues will join me in supporting efforts that put an end to this ongoing problem that harms every single American, especially those living paycheck to paycheck and trying to raise a family.

RECOGNIZING DEPUTY CHIEF DAN SZYKULSKI

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Deputy Chief

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H979

Dan Szykalski. In January, Dan retired as deputy chief of the Blaine Police Department.

Dan served with the Blaine Police Department for 38 years. During that time, he saw many changes in the city and his department.

Deputy Chief Szykalski had the respect and admiration of his fellow officers. Often described as a hard worker and team player, Dan was always there to lend a hand on emergency calls or bring in home-cooked meals for officers working on holidays.

Dan earned numerous awards during his career, including the Chief's Compassion Award and a Certificate of Recognition from the city of Blaine. I should note, however, that possibly my favorite thing about Dan was his reputation as the best hockey player in the station. He will certainly be missed at the annual Guns and Hoses hockey game. Maybe he will be able to return with an alumni exception.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Dan for his service, and I congratulate him on his retirement.

#### RECOGNIZING DR. RICHARD LEE

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the career of Dr. Richard Lee. Dr. Lee is retiring as executive director of the Central Minnesota Mental Health Center.

Dr. Lee has led the center for the past 6 years. In that time, Dr. Lee has been a champion for expanding mental health resources in central Minnesota. I have had the privilege to work with Dr. Lee and have been fortunate to visit the Central Minnesota Mental Health Center to see the great work they do.

Under Dr. Lee's leadership, the Central Minnesota Mental Health Center cultivated and expanded strong community partnerships with local counties, law enforcement, and healthcare agencies. Dr. Lee also helped develop and expand the Co-Responder Program that partners mental health professionals with law enforcement officers to respond to behavioral health calls.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Dr. Lee for the incredible impact he has had on expanding access and availability of mental health care in central Minnesota and wish him an enjoyable and well-deserved retirement.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF GREGORY "BUTCH" BAKEBERG

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Gregory "Butch" Bakeberg, a constituent, a friend, and a leader in Minnesota's agriculture community.

Butch passed away last month at the age of 74, but his legacy and work for the Sixth District and the city of Waverly, Minnesota, will continue to have an impact.

Butch was born in Minneapolis, Minnesota, but moved to Waverly where his family owned and operated Goldview Farm. Butch and his wife, Faye, were active in their community for decades, getting involved with the Wright County American Dairy Asso-

ciation and helping start the Wright County Breakfast on the Farm Committee. Butch and Faye were known to host countless agricultural-related events on their farm with the goal of educating fellow Minnesotans on dairy farming. They also host the occasional Sunday mass on the family farm as well.

Last year, I had an opportunity to visit Butch on his family's farm, and I am glad I did. Butch and Faye truly represent the best of Minnesota, and while we mourn the loss of a leader in our community, Butch's contribution to our community will live on for years to come.

#### REMEMBERING LORAL I. DELANEY

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Loral I. Delaney. Loral I passed away on September 19, 2021, after battling breast cancer.

Loral I was a shooting-sports legend. In 1957, at the age of 19, Loral I competed in her first event, the Minnesota State Trap Shoot, which she won with a near-perfect score. Loral I would go on to win seven Grand American World Trapshooting Championships, five of them consecutively. Loral I remains the only woman to win more than two championships in a row and more than four in total.

Loral I not only loved to compete, but she had an incredible passion for animals, as well. She and her husband, Chuck, ran Armstrong Ranch Kennels in Ramsey, Minnesota, providing grooming and training for some of Minnesota's premier hunting dogs. Loral I also founded an event known as Game Fair, an annual event known and beloved by sportsmen and -women and hunting enthusiasts throughout Minnesota and beyond.

Loral I leaves a tremendous legacy behind her; she will be missed dearly. To Chuck and her family, we offer our sincere condolences.

#### HONORING PRESIDENT ABRAHAM LINCOLN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I grew up about 20 miles from Springfield, Illinois, and President Lincoln's boyhood home is in my congressional district in Spencer County, Indiana. President Lincoln's birthday is this Saturday, February 12, so I want to highlight some of his speeches and recognize the enduring importance of his words.

First is his farewell speech to Springfield delivered February 11, 1861: "My friends, no one, not in my situation, can appreciate my feeling of sadness at this parting. To this place, and the kindness of these people, I owe everything."

"Here I have lived a quarter of a century and have passed from a young to an old man. Here my children have been born and one is buried."

"I now leave, not knowing when, or whether ever, I may return, with a task

before me greater than that which rested upon Washington."

"Without the assistance of the Divine Being, who ever attended him, I cannot succeed."

"With that assistance, I cannot fail. Trusting in Him who can go with me, and remain with you, and be everywhere for good, let us confidently hope that all will yet be well."

"To His care commending you, as I hope in your prayers you will commend me, I bid you an affectionate farewell."

Notice the importance of faith to President Lincoln in his farewell speech to Springfield. I do believe the loss of faith amongst elected officials has been detrimental to our country. It seems that we go out of our way to eliminate any mention of faith in public life. This is a mistake.

Next, Mr. Speaker, President Lincoln's address at Independence Hall February 22, 1861, on George Washington's birthday: "I am filled with deep emotion at finding myself standing here, in this place, where were collected together the wisdom, the patriotism, the devotion to principle from which sprang the institutions under which we live."

"You have kindly suggested to me that in my hands is the task of restoring peace to the present distracted condition of the country. I can say in return, Sir, that all the political sentiments I entertain have been drawn, so far as I have been able to draw them, from the sentiments which originated and were given to the world from this hall."

"I have never had a feeling politically that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence. I have often pondered over the dangers which were incurred by the men who assembled here and framed and adopted that Declaration of Independence."

"I have pondered over the toils that were endured by the officers and soldiers of the army who achieved that Independence."

"I have often inquired of myself, what great principle or idea it was that kept this Confederacy so long together."

"It was not the mere matter of the separation of the Colonies from the motherland; but that sentiment in the Declaration of Independence which gave liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but, I hope, to the world for all future time."

"It was that which gave promise that in due time the weight would be lifted from the shoulders of all men. This is a sentiment embodied in that Declaration of Independence."

"Now, my friends, can this country be saved upon that basis? If it can, I will consider myself one of the happiest men in the world, if I can help to save it. If it cannot be saved upon that principle, it will be truly awful."

"But, if this country cannot be saved without giving up that principle, I was about to say I would rather be assassinated on this spot than to surrender it."

"Now, in my view of the present aspect of affairs, there need be no bloodshed and war. There is no necessity for it. I am not in favor of such a course, and I may say, in advance, that there will be no bloodshed unless it be forced upon the Government, and then it will be compelled to act in self-defense.

"My friends, this is wholly an unexpected speech, and I did not expect to be called upon to say a word when I came here. I supposed it was merely to do something toward raising the flag. I may, therefore, have said something indiscreet. I have said nothing but what I am willing to live by, and, if it be the pleasure of Almighty God, die by."

It is impossible to compare any situation we, as a Nation, are in today with a battle between families, brothers, sisters, and Americans that was the American Civil War. I am not attempting today in any way to do so. With that being said, the words of President Lincoln in his second inaugural address, which I am about ready to read, is an inspiration, I think, and should be to all of us.

"With malice toward none with charity for all with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right let us strive on to finish the work we are in to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish just and lasting peace amongst ourselves and all nations."

□ 1215

#### TRIBUTE TO DR. EILEEN LANGDON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Dr. Eileen Langdon of Johnston County, North Carolina. Following more than 30 years working as a distinguished veterinarian at Willowrun Veterinary Hospital in Smithfield, Dr. Langdon is retiring.

In the words of Dr. Langdon, she "felt called to serve the ones in our world who seemingly have no voice. The ones who need an advocate." As a devoted Christian, God's plan led her to Auburn University where she received her degree in veterinary medicine in 1986.

She joined the Willowrun Veterinary family and healthcare team as an associate veterinarian in 1990 and became a partner at the practice in 2007. Dr. Langdon is cherished by her colleagues. Her many years of hard work and expertise, without a doubt, have built a lasting legacy of exceptional service, as well as mentorship to other women in the profession that will provide a lasting influence.

Though she will be retiring from Willowrun with a tremendous record of achievement, she will be moving on to

do what she loves, working full-time on the family farm with her husband and three children. The Langdon family farm is a third generation farm in the McGees Crossroads community—a family I know quite well—not all that far from my own family's farm. Like all of our wonderful farm families, preserving natural resources is always their top priority as they grow crops and livestock.

In addition to her veterinarian career and working on the family farm, Dr. Langdon served for 10 years as a member of the Johnston County Board of Health. She has been an active church member, and she has received recognition as a Paul Harris Fellow through the Rotary Club of Central Johnston County for her years of service to the community. Dr. Langdon and her husband are also inducted members of the Johnston County Agricultural Hall of Fame.

I commend and thank Dr. Langdon for her many years of service to our community, State, and country. May God continue to bless her path and that of the Langdon family.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE CRAIG OLIVE

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to my friend, Craig Olive, who has served as Johnston County Register of Deeds since December 2002.

Craig found a love for politics at an early age, and he assisted many local and statewide candidates by putting up signs as a young boy. During his involvement as a volunteer for the Johnston County Republican Party, he helped bring rise to the Republican Party in Johnston County in eastern North Carolina.

Beyond politics and his own service as register of deeds, he has served his community in a variety of ways and he continues to do so. He is a past member of the Board of Advisors for the Paul A. Johnston Auditorium and Johnston Community College, a past member of the Capital Campaign for the Johnston County Heritage Center Community, and a past member of the Johnston County Tourism Board—just to name a few.

He also helped spearhead an annual ceremony remembering those who have lost their lives to dementia and honoring those currently living with dementia as well as their caregivers. Even long before these contributions and his election to office, Craig was awarded the Long Leaf Pine, an award that is bestowed on North Carolinians, the highest civilian honor the State bestows.

During his tenure as Johnston County Register of Deeds, Craig has had tremendous accomplishments implementing major improvements in automation, technology, and customer service. His office was the first Register of Deeds office in North Carolina to electronically record documents, and the first office in the Nation to electronically record a survey map.

He has worked tirelessly to ensure that the county's history is preserved

and secure within his office while performing the duties of his office under budget. He has returned \$4.1 million to the county, which is a tremendous savings to Johnston County taxpayers.

Mr. Olive also worked with me during my time in the North Carolina Senate to introduce a bill to improve identity theft protection. This bill became law in 2009 and was a direct result of his great efforts.

In 2016, Craig implemented a Thank A Vet program to assist veterans by providing them with an ID. An added benefit of this program is that it allows for better safekeeping of veterans' military discharge papers.

Since the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic, his office has faced many challenges, yet he has been determined to remain open to assist our citizens. He continues to lead the way in providing the highest level of efficiency, productivity, innovation, and service to the people of Johnston County in North Carolina.

Thank you, Craig, for your commitment to your family, your neighbors, and to the citizens of Johnston County and beyond.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CARSON) at 2 p.m.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

God our creator, we pray this day that in Your immeasurable mercy, You would look favorably upon us. We bow our heads to our hearts and pray for compassion for the needs You call us to attend and for awareness to the burdens borne by the fellow servants we serve alongside.

Give us this day a spirit of wisdom and understanding. May the eyes of our hearts be enlightened to the hope to which You call us. May our wills be open and receptive to accomplish the tasks You would have us do. May our spirits be keen to share Your love with all those we encounter.

Lord, You have blessed us richly with a remarkable legacy. May we acknowledge that glorious inheritance of faith with lives worthy of the mantle of responsibility You have laid upon us.

Give us the courage to live into Your grace plan for us this day. We pray this in the strength of Your holy name.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(a) of House Resolution 188, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. UNDERWOOD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. UNDERWOOD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### ANOTHER HISTORIC INVESTMENT IN AMERICA

(Ms. UNDERWOOD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, last week, House Democrats advanced yet another historic investment in the American people, the America COMPETES Act. Not only will the America COMPETES Act strengthen our economic and national security, it supports the production of U.S. semiconductors, which play a role in nearly every sector of our economy.

This critical \$52 billion investment in semiconductors will address chip shortages and supply chain disruptions, lowering car costs for consumers while creating good-paying jobs. I have heard from my neighbors how much they have been feeling the recent spike in new and used car prices and wait times, and this bill will help.

The America COMPETES Act also makes transformational investments in research, authorizing a new program to advance accelerator technology and build on the work of scientists at Fermilab National Accelerator Facility in my district.

I am proud to support this comprehensive legislation to boost American competitiveness and broaden economic opportunity, and I urge my colleagues in the Senate to act swiftly to send it to President Biden's desk.

### IOWA'S INDEPENDENT BEEF PRODUCERS

(Mr. FEENSTRA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FEENSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of Iowa's independent beef producers amid the ongoing DOJ investigations into anti-competitive behavior by the Big Four Meat Packers.

On Wednesday, JBS Foods, the world's largest meat supplier, paid \$52 million to sweep their price-fixing shenanigans under the rug. But they can't hide what we have known all along. These big meat packers are illegally distorting the market to increase their profits and at the expense on Iowa family farmers. It is shameful and it is wrong.

That is why we need to pass the Cattle Price Discovery and Transparency Act to finally hold big packers accountable and help Iowa's small, independent producers compete on a level playing field. That is what a free and fair market is all about. It is time that DOJ do its job and take real steps to hold Big Four Meat Packers accountable.

We have waited long enough.

### HONORING THE LIFE OF ESTEBAN TORRES

(Mr. TAKANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay my respects to the late, former Congressman Esteban Torres, a devoted and beloved Chicano civil rights champion. I knew Mr. Torres in the 1990s during my first campaigns for Congress. I was honored by his support of my early campaigns and benefitted greatly from his counsel and his goodwill. We should all find inspiration in his rise from very humble beginnings to becoming a highly respected and influential Member of Congress. Indisputably, Mr. Torres was a trailblazing Latino leader and immigration advocate, who opened the space of greater diversity and representation in California politics for all people.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the life of a Korean war veteran, labor leader, community development executive, diplomat, and Member of Congress who continued to make a difference in his retirement.

To the Torres family and all those who have been inspired by him, I offer my deepest condolences.

### RECOGNIZING KOLE KING

(Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a young man from my district who is dominating motorcycle racing. Kole King of Burlington, Iowa, recently won the Grand National Hooligan Championship in Pensacola, Florida.

At just 25, Kole has already reached the top of flat-track motorcycle racing. Through 13 races during last sea-

son, he won 8 times, blowing past his competition. Kole has been racing since he was a young child and is a great example that if you work hard and do what you love, your dreams can come true.

Good luck, Kole King, the now-defending champion. Iowa is cheering for you.

### STAND WITH POLICE

(Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, right now crime throughout America is on the rise. One year ago, Democrats across our country began their calls to defund the police. And now, today, we are seeing the sad reality that their words and actions have had deadly consequences throughout American communities.

Last year, over a dozen U.S. cities set dismal new records for the number of murders that have occurred in their streets. What we are seeing right now is more drugs, more carjackings, more violence, and more crime. And through all of it, our police officers have been forced not only to battle this new wave of lawlessness, but also they have been fighting to keep the funding that provides the training and the equipment that they need to keep us safe.

It is actually very simple to see, we cannot afford to defund the police. We cannot afford to leave our communities vulnerable to crime. It is time for liberals to take public safety seriously. It is time to back the men and women in blue. And it is time to stand up for law enforcement.

### FENTANYL DRUG OVERDOSES

(Mr. WALBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, each year, too many lives are cut short because of drug overdoses. And fentanyl and its analogs, most of which originate from China, are making this crisis even worse.

Sadly, under the Biden administration's porous border policies, many of these deadly drugs are flooding across the southern border and devastating communities across the country. We need to use every available resource to fight back, including giving law enforcement the flexibility to go after drug traffickers who flout the law. Unless we take action, an important tool—the DEA's emergency scheduling order for fentanyl-related substances—will expire this very month.

It is past time to make this scheduling classification permanent, and I am proud to cosponsor the HALT Fentanyl Act to do just that.

Mr. Speaker, let's pass this bill, secure the border, and stem the tide of the growing fentanyl crisis.

### HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF DR. PAUL BROWN

(Mr. BALDERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life and legacy of my dear friend, Dr. Paul Brown, past President of Zane State College, and a respected voice for higher education in Ohio. I was heartbroken to learn of his sudden passing last week.

Among the many accomplishments over his 30-year career was his work to modernize Zane State for better preparing students for success in their careers and in life. Under his leadership, Zane State had over 70 percent growth in enrollment and record-setting job placement.

It was an honor to work alongside Paul for so many years. I extend my heartfelt condolences to his wife, Linda, and the entire Brown family.

### HONORING CLARENCE “TAFFY” ABEL AND 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF FIRST NATIVE AMERICAN IN WINTER OLYMPICS

(Mr. BERGMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 100th anniversary of the first Native American in the Winter Olympics and fellow Yooper, Clarence “Taffy” Abel.

Taffy was born in Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, on May 28, 1900, and was a member of the Sault Tribe of the Chippewa Indians. Following his childhood years, he joined the U.S. National Hockey Team in the first Winter Olympics in 1924. From there, he was selected by his fellow athletes to carry the American flag during the opening ceremonies and helped the U.S. win a Silver Medal.

Taffy went on to lead a successful professional career in the NHL with the New York Rangers and Chicago Blackhawks, resulting in two Stanley Cups, and was greatly respected by many of his peers. His accomplishments significantly advanced international hockey as an institution by tearing down many sport and cultural barriers.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to join me in recognizing this historic anniversary and the legacy of Clarence “Taffy” Abel.

### ARGENTINA’S ONE BELT, ONE ROAD INITIATIVE

(Mr. GAETZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, while the Biden administration, the media, and many in Congress beat the drums of war for Ukraine, there is a far more

significant threat to our Nation accelerating rapidly close to home.

Argentina, a critical nation and economy in the Americas, has just lashed itself to the Chinese Communist Party by signing on to the One Belt, One Road Initiative.

The cost to China was \$23.7 billion, a mere fraction of a rounding error when compared to the trillions of dollars our country has spent trying to build democracies out of sand and blood in the Middle East.

China buying influence and infrastructure in Argentina to collaborate on space and nuclear energy is a direct challenge to the Monroe Doctrine, and far more significant to American security than our latest NATO flirtation in the plains of Eastern Europe.

China is a rising power. Russia is a declining power. Let us sharpen our focus so that we do not join them in that eventual fate.

### RECOGNIZING ORION JEAN

(Mr. ELLZEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ELLZEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the floor today and bring attention to an extraordinary young man from Mansfield, Texas, named Orion Jean.

In 2020, Orion was selected as the National Kindness Speech Contest Winner. With the cash prize that Orion received from the speech contest, he created his own initiative focused on community and kindness, called Race to Kindness.

His first project was Race to 500 Toys. Orion collected and personally donated over 600 books to the Children’s Medical Center of Dallas, but Orion did not stop there. He continued on with his next Race to Kindness project, Race to 100,000 Meals. With the support of local communities and non-profit organizations, Orion fed over 100,000 people during Thanksgiving 2020.

Orion’s efforts not only reached the people of District 6, but with his most recent endeavor, Race to 500,000 Books, he has collected 500,000 books and is distributing them to Mansfield Independent School District, Fort Worth Independent School District, and Dallas Independent School District, along with several literacy organizations.

Just when you think this young man could not get any more impressive, he is also a published author with his debut book, “A Kids Book About Leadership,” which encourages children to discover the power of leadership that resides within themselves.

He has appeared on Good Morning America and The Ellen Show, where he received a \$10,000 donation for Race to Kindness. And right now, Orion is a Top 5 finalist for Time’s Kid of the Year 2021.

Orion’s goal is to pull kindness to the forefront and show the true power of community and how those two quali-

ties can change people’s lives. We should all strive to be more like Orion Jean.

□ 1415

### MASKING CHILDREN IS CHILD ABUSE

(Mrs. GREENE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about how children feel about masks.

You see, while they are watching television, seeing Super Bowl games where adults are filling stadiums without masks and enjoying themselves, and while they see concerts happen, they see people go to work, they see adults going many places all over this country without masks, they are forced to wear a mask every single day at school, and it is wrong. Actually, it is child abuse.

Now, I know that sounds like strong words, but it really is because children are not at risk of COVID-19. As a matter of fact, children are at the lowest risk.

Do you know what is harmful to children? Having their faces covered all day long at school, not being able to see each other’s faces; not being able to see their teachers’ faces; and not being able to learn properly speech, emotions, having that connection, seeing each other’s faces, and learning from adults seeing each other’s faces.

Now, while Democrats are going on with the mask for thee and not for me, kids have had enough. And they are going to be future voters. They are sick and tired of being forced to wear a mask. It needs to end. Masking children is child abuse.

### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 2 o’clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1700

### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. DEGETTE) at 5 p.m.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Adrian Swann, one of his secretaries.

### ENDING FORCED ARBITRATION OF SEXUAL ASSAULT AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT ACT OF 2021

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 900, I call up

the bill (H.R. 4445) to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration of disputes involving sexual assault and sexual harassment, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–29 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

#### H.R. 4445

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act of 2021”.

#### SEC. 2. PREDISPUTE ARBITRATION OF DISPUTES INVOLVING SEXUAL ASSAULT AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 9 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### “CHAPTER 4—ARBITRATION OF DISPUTES INVOLVING SEXUAL ASSAULT AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT

“Sec.

“401. Definitions.

“402. No validity or enforceability.

#### “§ 401. Definitions

“In this chapter:

“(1) PREDISPUTE ARBITRATION AGREEMENT.—The term ‘predispute arbitration agreement’ means any agreement to arbitrate a dispute that had not yet arisen at the time of the making of the agreement.

“(2) PREDISPUTE JOINT-ACTION WAIVER.—The term ‘predispute joint-action waiver’ means an agreement, whether or not part of a predispute arbitration agreement, that would prohibit, or waive the right of, one of the parties to the agreement to participate in a joint, class, or collective action in a judicial, arbitral, administrative, or other forum, concerning a dispute that has not yet arisen at the time of the making of the agreement.

“(3) SEXUAL ASSAULT DISPUTE.—The term ‘sexual assault dispute’ means a dispute involving a nonconsensual sexual act or sexual contact, as such terms are defined in section 2246 of title 18 or similar applicable Tribal or State law, including when the victim lacks capacity to consent.

“(4) SEXUAL HARASSMENT DISPUTE.—The term ‘sexual harassment dispute’ means a dispute relating to any of the following conduct directed at an individual or a group of individuals:

“(A) Unwelcome sexual advances.

“(B) Unwanted physical contact that is sexual in nature, including assault.

“(C) Unwanted sexual attention, including unwanted sexual comments and propositions for sexual activity.

“(D) Conditioning professional, educational, consumer, health care or long-term care benefits on sexual activity.

“(E) Retaliation for rejecting unwanted sexual attention.

#### “§ 402. No validity or enforceability

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, at the election of the person alleging conduct constituting a sexual harassment dispute or sexual assault dispute, or the named representative of a class or in a collective

action alleging such conduct, no predispute arbitration agreement or predispute joint-action waiver shall be valid or enforceable with respect to a case which is filed under Federal, Tribal, or State law and relates to the sexual assault dispute or the sexual harassment dispute.

“(b) DETERMINATION OF APPLICABILITY.—An issue as to whether this chapter applies with respect to a dispute shall be determined under Federal law. The applicability of this chapter to an agreement to arbitrate and the validity and enforceability of an agreement to which this chapter applies shall be determined by a court, rather than an arbitrator, irrespective of whether the party resisting arbitration challenges the arbitration agreement specifically or in conjunction with other terms of the contract containing such agreement, and irrespective of whether the agreement purports to delegate such determinations to an arbitrator.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title 9 of the United States Code is amended—

(A) in section 2, by inserting “or as otherwise provided in chapter 4” before the period at the end;

(B) in section 208—

(i) in the section heading, by striking “**Chapter 1; residual application**” and inserting “**Application**”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following: “This chapter applies to the extent that this chapter is not in conflict with chapter 4.”; and

(C) in section 307—

(i) in the section heading, by striking “**Chapter 1; residual application**” and inserting “**Application**”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following: “This chapter applies to the extent that this chapter is not in conflict with chapter 4.”.

(2) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—

(A) CHAPTER 2.—The table of sections for chapter 2 of title 9, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 208 and inserting the following:

“208. Application.”.

(B) CHAPTER 3.—The table of sections for chapter 3 of title 9, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 307 and inserting the following:

“307. Application.”.

(3) TABLE OF CHAPTERS.—The table of chapters for title 9, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“4. Arbitration of disputes involving sexual assault and sexual harassment ..... 401”.

#### SEC. 3. APPLICABILITY.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall apply with respect to any dispute or claim that arises or accrues on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

After 1 hour of debate, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment printed in part B of House Report 117–241, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be considered read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER) and the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 4445.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 4445, the Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act, would restore access to justice for survivors of sexual assault or sexual harassment who are forced to settle their disputes against their harassers and abusers in a private system of arbitration that is often stacked against them.

Arbitration was originally developed as an alternative to the court system for parties of relatively equal bargaining power to enter into voluntarily. In recent decades, however, forced arbitration clauses have become ubiquitous in our lives, largely in the form of take-it-or-leave-it contracts between very large companies and individual consumers. As a result, these clauses have rendered our court system, in which plaintiffs have far stronger protections, inaccessible to far too many.

Nowhere is that trend more apparent or problematic than in the workplace. It is projected that, by 2024, 80 percent of private-sector workers will be forced to sign an arbitration clause when accepting employment. And consider that, over the past 5 years, employers prevailed over their employees in 98 percent of these arbitration cases. But these numbers cannot capture the true human toll of forced arbitration.

Last November, the Judiciary Committee heard powerful testimony from four survivors of sexual assault and sexual harassment about their harrowing experiences and the deep wounds they continue to carry with them to this day. It was a hearing none of us will forget, and we appreciate these brave women coming forward and sharing their stories.

Each of these women was subject to horrific treatment by a person with power over their lives. Then, when they sought to hold their assailants accountable in court, they were forced to relive the trauma of their harassment and assault to find that their only recourse was a secretive arbitration process that was stacked against them.

Forced arbitration clauses, buried deep in the fine print of the paperwork required as a condition of employment, have bound workers to a system in which they are nearly guaranteed to fail, foreclosed the possibility of ever having their day in court, and in almost every case taken away their right even to discuss their experience.

The company gets to pick the judge and the jury, truncate the discovery process, choose the law applied, and



prevent all appeals. When the company wins, it can request that the victim pay its attorney's fees, and it can ensure that misconduct never sees the light of day.

H.R. 4445 removes these barriers to justice for survivors of sexual assault or sexual harassment by giving them a real choice of whether to go to court or to arbitrate their claim.

In doing so, this legislation ends this unjust and, frankly, repulsive system in which American companies are better off retaliating against victims of sexual assault than taking responsibility and holding perpetrators responsible for their horrific actions.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter to Members of Congress dated February 4, 2022, and a letter to House leadership dated February 7, 2022, both from organizations in support of H.R. 4445.

FEBRUARY 4, 2022.

Re Pass the Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act of 2021 (H.R. 4445).

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: On behalf of the undersigned organizations, we write in support of the Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act of 2021 (H.R. 4445), a bill that would provide important new opportunities for individuals who experience sexual harassment and assault to seek justice without being forced into closed-door and secretive forced arbitration proceedings, where the deck is too often stacked against them.

Today, individuals are routinely forced to sign an arbitration clause to resolve disputes as a condition of obtaining a job or purchasing a good or service, often through language buried in fine print. Many individuals who sign such documents have no idea they have waived the ability to enforce their rights in court. Arbitrators are often chosen and paid by companies. There is no public record of the proceedings or the outcome, and rarely an opportunity to appeal the arbitrator's decision. Many who come forward with reports of sexual harassment or sexual assault, cannot afford legal counsel. The arbitration clause may force them to bear some of the significant costs of the arbitration. The resolution of their disputes may fail to make them whole for the harm they have suffered.

The lack of public accountability enabled by forced arbitration has played a harmful role in allowing sexual harassment and assault to persist in the shadows. In the four years since #MeToo went viral, thousands of individuals, disproportionately women, have come forward to share their experiences—many several years after the fact—and to demand justice. When women and all those who have experienced assault and harassment share their stories, it gives others the courage to come forward as well. But when women who report such conduct are forced into arbitration, that secretive process with no public accountability further silences survivors, and employers and companies can continue to employ and protect serial sexual harassers.

The Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act is an important step towards restoring power to survivors of sexual assault and sexual harassment by ensuring they will not be forced into arbitration. It is admittedly a partial solution, as no individual should be forced to waive their ability to fully enforce their rights to be free from other forms of unlaw-

ful harassment, discrimination, and exploitation, whether as workers, as consumers, as patients, or as students. We are therefore hopeful that as a complement to this bill, Congress will quickly take up and pass the FAIR Act (H.R. 963) and Restoring Justice for Workers Act (H.R. 4841), which would ensure that companies can no longer circumvent the legal system by forcing individuals into arbitration. But the Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act represents an important partial restoration of individuals' rights to seek accountability and justice. Accordingly, we urge you to support this legislation. If you have any questions, please contact Emily Martin ([emartin@nwc.org](mailto:emartin@nwc.org)) at the National Women's Law Center.

Sincerely,

National Women's Law Center, National Employment Law Project, National Employment Lawyers Association.

FEBRUARY 7, 2022.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND MINORITY LEADER MCCARTHY: We, the undersigned groups, support passage of H.R. 4445, the Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act of 2021. This bipartisan bill would empower survivors of sexual assault and sexual harassment by allowing survivors of sexual harassment and sexual assault to file a case in court rather than be forced into arbitration. Survivors of sexual assault and sexual harassment would be able to hold perpetrators and institutions accountable outside of closed-door arbitration proceedings and shine light on systemic issues of wrongdoing. According to actor Eliza Dushku, one of several witnesses who testified under the protection of congressional subpoenas, at a powerful hearing last November on H.R. 4445, forced arbitration "protects the harassers, the abusers, the corporations, and it isolates the victims . . . [it] creates a culture of silencing."

Many of the undersigned groups oppose the use of forced arbitration against all consumers and workers. Predispute binding arbitration clauses and class action waivers, together known as forced arbitration clauses, are typically buried in "take-it-or-leave-it" agreements that waive an individual's fundamental rights to seek accountability in court when they are hurt or when their rights are violated. These clauses deprive people of the opportunity to hold wrongdoers accountable, no matter how widespread or egregious the misconduct may be; and they also allow all types of abuse, discrimination, and fraud to go unchecked.

In the privatized system of forced arbitration, there is no judge or jury, and the right to appeal is severely limited. Arbitrators do not have to follow the law or precedent. And proceedings take place behind a veil of secrecy that insulates perpetrators from public accountability. That is why thousands of Google workers around the world walked off the job in late 2018 to protest, among other things, Google's use of forced arbitration clauses to hide mistreatment of workers who alleged harassment and discrimination against high-level executives. Also in 2018, in a rare gesture of bipartisanship, all 56 attorneys general (in every state, the District of Columbia, and territories) urged Congress to immediately enact legislation that would ban forced arbitration for sexual harassment claims. The letter said, "Victims of such serious misconduct should not be constrained to pursue relief from decision makers who are not trained as judges, are not qualified to act as courts of law and are not positioned to ensure that such victims are accorded both procedural and substantive due process."

The Senate companion bill, which passed the Senate Judiciary Committee on a voice

vote, has ten Republican co-sponsors, and support continues to grow. Conservative commentator and women's rights advocate Gretchen Carlson, who has been a vocal opponent of the way forced arbitration clauses are used to silence victims of sexual harassment, recently said that passing H.R. 4445 "will be a victory for American workers and I am incredibly optimistic this is going to be the law of the land."

H.R. 4445 has widespread, bipartisan support inside and outside the walls of Congress. We urge all Members of the House to vote for this important legislation. Your staff should feel free to reach out to Remington A. Gregg should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

American Association for Justice, American Civil Liberties Union, Alliance for Justice, American Family Voices, Americans for Financial Reform, Center for Disability Rights, Center for Economic Justice, Center for Justice & Democracy, Citizen Works, Consumer Action.

Consumer Federation of America, Consumer Reports, Consumer Watchdog, Consumers for Auto Reliability and Safety, Center for Progressive Reform, Disability Rights Education & Defense Fund, Earthjustice, Economic Policy Institute, Essential Information, FORGE, Inc.

Googlers for Ending Forced Arbitration, Impact Fund, Justice for Migrant Women, The Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, Maryland Consumer Rights Coalition, Mazzoni Center, National Association of Consumer Advocates, National Black Justice Coalition, National Consumer Law Center (on behalf of its low income clients), National Consumers League.

National Disability Rights Network (NORN), National Employment Law Project, National Organization for Women, People's Parity Project, Public Citizen, Public Good Law Center, Public Law Center, SC Applesseed Legal Justice Center, Service Employees International Union (SEIU), Texas Watch.

The Army of Survivors, URGE: Unite for Reproductive & Gender Equity, Women Employed, Woodstock Institute, Workplace Fairness, YWCA USA.

Mr. NADLER. I thank my colleagues, Representatives BUSTOS, GRIFFITH, JAYAPAL, and BUCK, for their leadership on this issue. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank my colleague from New York for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

We are here today to discuss H.R. 4445. Sexual harassment and sexual assault are despicable actions. Victims of sexual harassment and assault must have their claims heard, and they should not be silenced or intimidated into silence.

The Judiciary Committee heard important testimony from victims of sexual harassment and assault. It took real courage for those victims to tell their stories to us. What those women, and many more women around the country, have had to face is terrible, and sexual harassment should not be tolerated.

H.R. 4445 would not make victims better off. And no matter how well-intentioned the bill may be, it raises real policy concerns.

The committee received testimony from experts explaining the bill's

flaws. For example, this bill's supporters seem to assume that all arbitration is secret, that arbitration automatically keeps victims from going to the authorities or publicizing their experiences.

That is not accurate. Arbitration is not intrinsically secret or otherwise confidential. Put simply, agreeing to resolve a case outside of court is different than agreeing to silence.

That distinction matters today because much of the argument for this bill comes from concerns about secrecy rather than whether justice can be served in the arbitration context.

Despite that emphasis, H.R. 4445 does not actually address confidentiality or nondisclosure agreements. Even if this bill is enacted, it is still possible that separate contract provisions could be used to impose confidentiality or keep details about an employer under wraps.

But in all likelihood, this bill would effectively end most arbitration in these contexts, even when arbitration would benefit a victim, because the bill fundamentally changes an arbitration clause from a mutual commitment to use an alternative dispute resolution into a one-sided election for an injured party.

If H.R. 4445 becomes law, contracts will be far less likely to include the option to arbitrate. If parties cannot agree in advance to arbitrate, the plaintiffs may never have access to arbitration. These unintended consequences will have real-world implications, especially for victims who lack deep pockets or do not have the possibility for a high-dollar settlement that some high-profile cases can obtain.

Lawsuits are often long and expensive, and big corporations have more resources to litigate than most victims. Litigation can be harrowing for victims who, in traditional litigation, must submit to rigorous discovery, depositions, or perhaps even the challenges of a public trial. And it may even be harder for victims to tell their stories in litigation and get justice, given the rules of evidence that may apply.

Democrats cast aside these concerns, and they ignore how arbitration is generally a good way to resolve disputes.

Why are some in Congress so intent on taking this legislation forward today? For years, Democrats have tried to gut arbitration agreements for all kinds of different claims and plaintiffs. If Democrats had their way, everyone—from consumers to civil rights plaintiffs, to those with antitrust claims, to individuals using financial service products, and others—would not be able to contract in advance to resolve disputes through arbitration. Instead, they would be forced into the courts.

Congress should stand ready to improve the legal system, but we must make sure that whatever Congress does will actually be an improvement. What we have before us today is Congress changing existing and agreed-to contracts.

I have real concerns about government retroactively nullifying existing contractual agreements, no matter how well-intentioned it is.

I urge you all to carefully consider the ramifications of H.R. 4445.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS), the sponsor of this bill.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise to speak enthusiastically in support of my bill, the Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act.

Five years ago, The Washington Post published a story that shocked me to my core. Madam Speaker, 69,000 women were suing Sterling, Inc., for sexual harassment, sexual assault, and sexual discrimination. Sterling is the parent company of Kay and Jared Jewelers.

And, yes, I did say 69,000. I had to double-check that over and over—not 69, not 6,900—69,000 women.

"If you didn't do what he wanted with him, you wouldn't get your"—preferred—"store or raise." That is what Sanya Douglas, a former employee, testified.

"A boozy, no-spouses-allowed 'sex fest,' where attendance was mandatory and women were aggressively pursued, groped, and harassed." That is how meetings at the company were described.

"You were meat, being shopped." That is how a former employee described her workplace.

Each story was more disturbing than the story before it: managers demanding sexual acts in exchange for employment benefits; company events where women were expected to undress publicly. In one story, a former employee attended an overnight meeting where she woke up with her underwear pushed down to her ankles, a manager raping her.

This type of sexual perverseness in the workplace went on for years, and it all stayed secret. And the reason for that secrecy? Because of one single legal clause hidden deep down in these women's employment paperwork, a clause that says if a claim arises between an employer and an employee, it must go to arbitration, and taking a case like this to court is prohibited.

My bill would make it illegal to enforce agreements that mandate third-party arbitration, which is a type of legal dispute resolution that is conducted behind closed doors and often favors the employer.

Seems simple, right? Well, that one tiny clause protected a company of abusers and silenced those 69,000 women just at Sterling, Inc. That is just one single company we are talking about.

But the stories go on, and the bad actors aren't just at workplaces. While 60 million—that is 60 million—Americans are working under these forced arbitration clauses through their employers,

the real number of people impacted by this incredibly common pitfall is huge. Many more millions of Americans have signed away their rights through property leases, ride-share applications, moving companies, nursing homes, grocery deliveries.

That terms and conditions box that we have all simply checked off after downloading an app or hiring a service might just have an arbitration clause hiding in it, ready to strip away your right to go to court if you have been sexually harassed or sexually assaulted and you choose to go to court.

□ 1715

While some companies have already eliminated this abusive practice—thank you to them—it is time to do away with these legal traps for good.

The Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act will invalidate any forced arbitration clause in any contract or agreement in the case of sexual assault or harassment.

And I am proud to say that my bill has widespread support among Republicans and Democrats over at the Senate and here at the House.

I thank those that have helped us get here today. I thank PRAMILA JAYAPAL, MORGAN GRIFFITH, KEN BUCK, DAVID CICILLINE, Chairman NADLER, Senators GILLIBRAND, LINDSEY GRAHAM and DICK DURBIN, and our fearless champion on this, Gretchen Carlson.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I look forward to the day when our sexual assault survivors can have their day in court.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4445, the Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act.

I believe pre-dispute arbitration agreements are useful in some circumstances. They can allow common, foreseeable disagreements to be resolved quickly and efficiently, but we must acknowledge in the case of sexual assault and sexual harassment, nobody signs on to an employment agreement thinking that oh, I am going to be sexually harassed or I am going to risk sexual abuse. They don't sign up for that. And most of these contracts, Madam Speaker, are what we call adhesion contracts. You have to accept it.

And what often happens is there will be a couple of pages that have all the big items: Terms of the employment, salary, promotion, vacation. And then they will incorporate a handbook. The handbook will then have buried in it language that says all disputes must go to mandatory arbitration. And oftentimes the people who are doing the arbitrating aren't lawyers. The rules of evidence aren't applied. The rules of law are not applied. It is just how they feel after they hear everything.

This has created a situation that, related to sexual assault and sexual harassment, is unconscionable. It shocks



the conscience. And in fairness, it is a violation of public policy, in my opinion, and should be eliminated as part of a contract.

I am surprised courts haven't already come to that conclusion, but instead of having each court in each of the States and territories make that decision, this act will do it once and for all, and we will have done our jobs to make sure that in these egregious situations the individual who is making the claim and who has probably been assaulted or has been harassed or has some kind of a valid claim will have an opportunity to go to court or have an opportunity to go to binding arbitration, if that is what they choose, but they will have a choice instead of having to go in front of company-picked arbiters who will make a decision for them that will affect them the rest of their lives.

Now, I will tell you that it is important that we move forward with this bill, and it looks like things are going well, but you never know. But I will also tell you that there has been an allegation that it is retroactive—and that is not accurate—as to cases currently pending. It is accurate as to contracts currently signed.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Madam Speaker, this is a landmark day. H.R. 4445, the Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act, will ensure that tens of millions of people are no longer silenced in instances where there is sexual harassment and sexual assault.

These forced arbitration agreements require that people with disputes against a company use a secretive, one-sided mediation process instead of the judicial system. Sexual assault and sexual harassment survivors with claims against a company are stripped of the right to decide how to pursue accountability for their perpetrator. It is a lose-lose scenario. People are left with little alternative but to sign these agreements, and yet, they often face retaliation and backlash when they are pursuing their claims.

This bipartisan bill is essential for survivors like Tatiana Spottiswoode, who bravely testified under the protection of a friendly subpoena at a House Judiciary Committee hearing. Tatiana needed that protection because forced arbitration took away all of her rights to speak publicly about the severe harassment that she had endured from her boss and her abuser, former CEO of Afiniti, Zia Chishti. At the hearing, Tatiana testified that "the person who changed my life forever continues to abuse me because forced arbitration gives him the power to do it in secret."

Tatiana's freedom to discuss her experiences publicly had real impact. Mr. Chishti was finally fired, and the former Prime Minister of the U.K. resigned from the advisory board of her abuser's company. Her story, and countless others like hers, show why this bill is so critical.

I am so proud to colead this bill with the incredible Representative CHERI BUSTOS. And I thank Representative BUSTOS and Representative MORGAN GRIFFITH and Representative KEN BUCK for their leadership, as well. No one should have to endure what happened to Tatiana and so many others like her. We have an opportunity in the House of Representatives to set this right for millions of brave survivors.

Vote "yes" to pass H.R. 4445.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES).

Mr. JEFFRIES. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished chair of the House Judiciary Committee for yielding and for his leadership. I thank my good friend and colleague Representative CHERI BUSTOS for her leadership.

The people of America, the women of America have a right to be free of sexual harassment. The women of America have a right to be free of sexual assault. The women of America have a right to be free of a hostile work environment. They deserve their day in court.

The process and practice of forced arbitration undermines these rights without providing an adequate remedy. The American people are being hoodwinked. The American people are being bamboozled. The American people are being led astray by forced arbitration.

This practice of forced arbitration is unfair, unjust, unacceptable, unconscionable, and un-American.

H.R. 4445 will make it unlawful.

I urge strong support for this legislation so that liberty and justice for all can prevail.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for allowing me to speak, and I want to commend my colleague, Representative CHERI BUSTOS, for introducing this very important legislation.

It is a travesty of justice for a woman to be subjected to sexual harassment and even sexual assault on the job. Oftentimes, it takes place in a job setting where there is a culture of sexual harassment and sexual assault.

And when these women find after they have been assaulted that they are barred from going to court because somehow they have been hoodwinked into a forced arbitration agreement with their employer, they are surprised because at that point they have been assaulted for a second time because when they go into arbitration you often find that the deck is stacked against the victim in favor of the perpetrator.

This legislation gets at that problem by making those kinds of agreements unenforceable. I fully support this leg-

islation. I would ask all of my colleagues to support it. It is good, commonsense legislation.

Justice is all that is asked for.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

For the fourth consecutive year I rise as one of the few but faithful Republicans in strong support of this good legislation.

Here is the question presented: Should sexual harassers who work for big businesses get to pick their juries in advance? I think that the populist, nationalist, right approach is to believe that the Article III courts that we have set up for any and all function as the proper venue.

But for tens of millions of American workers, that courthouse door is locked. It is closed. It is inaccessible. The result is that a system exists for concierge justice, private-sector justice.

The evidence before the Judiciary Committee undeniably is that big business wins more cases, shuts down more awards, and is able to reduce awards in the arbitration setting as opposed to the setting that anybody else would be able to enter in a taxpayer-funded court. That is wrong.

We have all heard about the fine print in this country. No one reads the fine print. But the fine print shouldn't be a reason that someone is more likely to have to endure sexual harassment in the workplace or more likely to evade consequence as the result of predatory behavior.

I especially thank the majority for incorporating a number of the minority's views to make this bill stronger and more likely to become law, and I sincerely hope that I am not here for a fifth year advocating for its passage again.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman for his leadership, and I thank my distinguished friend from Illinois, Congresswoman BUSTOS for her constant determination.

It is wonderful that H.R. 4445 is restoring freedom and justice to women. It is a bipartisan piece of legislation that will not allow any pre-dispute arbitration agreement or pre-dispute joint action waiver to be valid or enforceable with respect to a case which is filed under Federal, Tribal, or State law and relates to a sexual assault dispute or sexual harassment dispute.

I am glad to hear friends on the other side, as this is a bipartisan bill, acknowledge the fact that this is an absolute injustice; an injustice that befalls a certain segment of the population, and that is women.

One of the cases that is most stark is the one of Stefani Bambace. Many witnesses came before us in the Judiciary

Committee. Witness after witness gave us horror stories of isolation and fear and the absolute inability, because of the fine print, to do anything about it.

Stefani Bambace alleged that she worked in a sexually charged and hostile work environment, including being subjected to sexually explicit language from her employer, sexual advances and groping. Let me say that again. Touching in her space from her employer, sexual advances and groping and explicit images. How can you work as a professional or anyone? Think of the levels of work that women are in; from domestic to as high a level as scientists and CEOs. But yet, they are subjected to this kind of behavior.

According to Ms. Bambace's petition, she complained to human resources to no avail about the harassment. And guess what her relief was? Guess what empathy was shown? Guess what comfort and reforming the system was? It was her being fired. That is right. She was fired. How many stories of women are there, that are yet not told, who were fired?

And so this agreement of which my colleague has worked on, and we are pleased in the Judiciary Committee to be part of moving this legislation, this will end these arbitration agreements that are snuck into a packet of materials that you sign.

It is imperative we pass it, but more importantly Madam Speaker, it is imperative that it is passed in the Senate because it is bipartisan, but it is signed by the President and becomes law.

I thank Ms. Bambace and all of the witnesses that came before us. They sacrifice, they suffered, but yet today, hopefully, will be an announcement, a pronouncement of freedom and justice for women who have struggled with this all of the time.

H.R. 4445 is a relief that is a long time in coming, and it should move away from blind, silent, quiet agreements that no one knows what it is. Freedom and justice for women in the workforce today.

Madam Speaker, I rise to speak in strong support of H.R. 4445, the Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act.

This bill will amend Title 9 of the United States Code, empowering survivors of sexual assault and harassment by restoring their access to justice and public accountability under the law.

By ending forced arbitration in lawsuits involving these claims, survivors of sexual assault or sexual harassment are empowered with making the decision on whether they wish to pursue legal action against their assailants which often includes going to court to arbitrate their claims.

It is estimated that 60 million Americans have signed away their right to seek real justice and most don't realize it until they try to get help.

H.R. 4445 will not allow any pre-dispute arbitration agreement or predispute joint-action waiver to be valid or enforceable with respect to a case which is filed under Federal, Tribal, or State law and relates to a sexual assault dispute or a sexual harassment dispute.

In the Judiciary markup which brought this bill to the floor, survivors of sexual harassment and sexual assault shared their stories with the committee about their devastating experiences and the subsequent arbitration process they were forced to endure as a condition of their employment.

The #MeToo movement chipped away at the culture of secrecy that protects predators and silences survivors.

Ending mandatory arbitration has the power to ensure that survivors of sexual harassment and discrimination in the workplace have their voices heard.

For example, in *Bambace v. Berry Y&V Fabricators, LLC*, Stefani Bambace alleged that she worked in a sexually charged and hostile work environment, including "being subjected to sexually explicit images from her employer, sexual advances, and groping."

According to her petition, she complained to Human Resources about the harassment and was fired three weeks later.

She filed a lawsuit alleging violations of Chapter 21 of the Texas Labor Code.

Like more than half of non-unionized American workers, Bambace was subject to an employer promulgated arbitration agreement.

These arbitration agreements are often snuck into a packet of materials employers give employees on their first day of employment to sign and they are rarely negotiated or even discussed.

In a well-reasoned opinion in *Bambace*, the Court held that the arbitration agreement, which required the Plaintiff to litigate sexual harassment claims in confidential and binding arbitration, violated public policy, injured the public good, and was therefore void and unenforceable.

Critically, the Court further rejected Defendant's argument that the arbitrator, not the Court, should determine whether the sexual harassment claims were subject to arbitration.

Fortunately, in the *Bambace* case Harris County Judge Lauren Reeder understood that cases such as these should be determined by a court, rather than an arbitrator irrespective of whether the agreement purports to delegate such determinations to an arbitrator.

This is just one story out of millions where forced arbitration agreements attempt, and usually succeed, to silence sexual assault and sexual harassment victims.

These forced "agreements" strip survivors of the right to decide how to pursue accountability of their predators.

Instead, these survivors' stories are heard in secret, behind closed doors, and do little to nothing to stop the systematic abuse from occurring again.

The Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act of 2021 will ensure that these survivors will have their voices heard in a court of law if they choose to do so.

No survivor of sexual harassment or sexual assault should be forced into silence, especially by a piece of paper buried within their employment agreement.

Forced arbitration allows companies to hide and shield sexual predators and keep employees from knowing that their other colleagues could be victims of the same person.

Voiding these clauses in sexual harassment and discrimination cases would aid victims by pulling back the veil of secrecy on bad behavior in the workplace.

More than 56% of Americans are subject to these mandatory arbitration agreements.

These victims deserve the right to choose to go to court, it should not be in the hands of their employer.

A 2011 Cornell University study found that employees are less likely to win arbitration cases.

These corporations embrace arbitration because it is a cheaper and faster way to settle disputes and can cut down frivolous lawsuits.

Corporations do not want to face juries because they know citizens will punish them for their wrongdoing, so they sneak arbitration language into their take-it-or-leave-it contracts.

Forced arbitration is a sexual harasser's best friend, it is an issue of fundamental human rights.

Eliza Dushku, an actress, testified that she had been fired from the CBS prime-time drama "Bull" after she asked her co-star, Michael Weatherly, a producer on the show, to stop harassing her.

She said he had made rape jokes about her and had told her in front of dozens of cast and crew members that he wanted to be in a threesome with her.

She said she had later learned that the contract she signed with CBS included a forced arbitration clause.

After a mediation, the company agreed to a confidential settlement that would pay Ms. Dushku \$9.5 million.

Situations such as Ms. Dushku's aim to sweep sexual harassment and assault cases under the rug.

Silencing these victims is exactly what forced arbitration agreements are meant to do and I believe we should no longer tolerate this behavior.

This is an excellent and common-sense bill that will ensure victims are not silenced by forced arbitration agreements any longer.

Although we cannot bring justice and a voice for those who have already settled their cases to their arbitration agreements, we can ensure that future victims will be heard and not suppressed in their truth.

□ 1730

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), a distinguished member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I heard some of my friends on the other side of the aisle say no one wants this legislation. Nothing could be further from the truth. The survivors of sexual assault and harassment want this, and we should listen to them.

H.R. 4445 would restore access to justice for victims of sexual assault or harassment who are currently locked out of the court system due to forced arbitration clauses. These clauses are everywhere. They block survivors from making their stories known, having their day in court, and prevents them from holding their abusers accountable.

Some of the stories we heard during this hearing were horrific of the kind

of abuse and assault and demeaning behavior, and those predators knew that they were protected from being held accountable because there were forced arbitration clauses often accompanied with provisions that kept those proceedings private.

So this private system forces survivors into a process, this forced arbitration, that is not like a court system. There is no discovery. There is no judge or jury. There are no requirements that they follow laws passed by the Congress or the State. And when you, as I said, combine that with non-disclosure agreements, it silences the survivors of sexual harassment and assault. Plain and simple. This bill will end it.

Predators rely on that silence. As long as their actions are hidden, they are free to act with impunity, and we heard evidence that is in fact what they do, over and over and over again. This bill will end that.

Madam Speaker, I thank the sponsor of this legislation, Congresswoman CHERI BUSTOS, who has made this her life's work since she got to Congress. This bill will help millions of survivors who have had the conduct that they have complained about unaddressed and unanswered and kept quiet, and it will end that practice.

We heard testimony about the founder of Invisalign and the CEO of Afiniti, who actually started an arbitration, invoked the clause, because he knew that would keep the proceedings secret and his abuse would go unaccounted for. This is disgraceful.

Madam Speaker, this should be a unanimous vote. Everyone should want to put an end to this practice. I urge you to vote "yes" on H.R. 4445.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), another distinguished member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, sexual harassment and violence in the workplace are a corrosive and pervasive threat to the success and dignity of all workers, but particularly women. And forced or mandatory arbitration clauses in employment contracts have played an important role in thwarting efforts to hold accountable the predators who engage in such conduct and the companies that allow it to continue.

The widespread use of these clauses in employment contracts forces many Americans to agree to a form of dispute resolution that silences victims of sexual harassment and assault and allows the harassers and employers to escape accountability. These arbitration proceedings overwhelmingly benefit the employer, which drafts the non-negotiable clauses dictating the venue, the terms of mediation, even the arbitrators themselves, as well as creating a perverse incentive for the allegedly

neutral arbiters to rule in favor of employers, lest they not be hired again.

In addition to denying survivors a public forum to expose sexual abuse, which can deter future misconduct, these arbitration clauses also preclude class actions, which is often the only way that employees can afford to bring successful claims.

H.R. 4445 would ban the use of forced arbitration in employment contracts in cases of sexual assault and harassment. In addition to protecting survivors of such harassment, that is just good public policy.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), another distinguished member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. RASKIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding. I salute our colleague, Congresswoman BUSTOS, for introducing what will certainly be the most important piece of pro-labor legislation to pass out of the 117th Congress. Our Constitution guarantees our people the right to a jury trial, but forced arbitration in the workplace brutally cheats victims of sexual harassment and assault in the workplace out of their right to a trial before a jury of their peers. And by stripping women of this right, forced arbitration is creating corporate cultures of pervasive and severe sexual harassment all across the country, like the one Eliza Dushku faced in Hollywood where she got fired for objecting to constant sexually degrading and humiliating treatment in the workplace.

We heard testimony from women sexually harassed and raped by repeat offenders who have been made proud and contemptuous because their conduct is consistently buried and hidden in regimes of coerced, closed-door arbitration. We have created monsters out of repeat-offender sexual harassers across the country.

Let's throw the doors open and let's let the sun shine in. Let's restore the full constitutional rights of women in the workplace. Let's pass this legislation.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4445. This is the way the legislative process should work. This started with a victim of sexual harassment, Gretchen Carlson, who stepped forward and brought a cancer within an organization to light, and did it in a courageous manner. Then my colleague, Congresswoman CHERI BUSTOS, took on this cause and wrote a good piece of legislation.

But what she did was even more important. She was open to suggestions and often adopted suggestions to make

this the very best legislation that it could be. And my friends, Congressman MATT GAETZ and MORGAN GRIFFITH, worked alongside her and worked on our side of the aisle to make folks aware of the need for this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4445 because, one, it empowers rape victims to make a choice between arbitration and going to court. It also makes sure that sexual predators are held accountable. And finally, it puts corporations on notice that if they don't clean up their act, they are going to have a big problem. There is no more sweeping an issue like this under the carpet. This is something that corporations are going to take seriously, and they are going to change their conduct as a result of a possible change to their bottom line.

This bill gives Members a choice to support rape victims or rapists. I choose to support the rape victims, the survivors of a terrible ordeal, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GARCIA), another distinguished member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank Chairman NADLER for yielding, and I thank the sponsor of this bill, CHERI BUSTOS, for her hard work.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for this bill, H.R. 4445. As a former judge, I have a very deeply held belief that everybody should have their day in court. It is a simple principle: Everybody should have their day in court. That is the essence of "justice for all" in our country. Every time we say the pledge and we end with "justice for all," we have to demonstrate that we mean it.

Survivors of sexual harassment and discrimination in the workplace deserve to have their voices heard. By ending forced arbitration in lawsuits involving sexual assault or sexual harassment claims, we ensure survivors are given a real choice of whether to go to court or to arbitrate their claim. Abusers will no longer be able to misuse arbitration law with dubious agreements and fine-print clauses to hide their violence and silence their victims.

I am proud that we are taking firm, bipartisan action to ensure justice for sexual harassment and sexual assault victims. I am proud that we are making sure that when little kids across America say "justice for all," that it truly means for "all."

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 4445.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ROSS), another distinguished member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. ROSS. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding, and especially thank our colleague, CHERI

BUSTOS, for bringing this important legislation to us.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4445, the Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act.

In 2017, our country experienced a dramatic and needed shift. Women in a variety of industries responded to news of allegations against powerful men with the hashtag #MeToo, banding together in solidarity to expose predatory behavior that has been overlooked and excused for generations. But some women are still not able to speak out against their abusers because forced arbitration agreements prevent them from doing so.

Last year, the House Committee on the Judiciary heard testimony from women from a variety of backgrounds and political parties, who have suffered the dual injustices of sexual abuse and forced silence through arbitration. Their stories illuminate how forced arbitration agreements are too often used to protect assailants and their companies at the expense of working women. It is past time for Congress to enable these women to reclaim their voices and take control over their own lives.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4445.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, the Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act is bipartisan. It is legislation that provides survivors with the resources they need to seek the justice that they deserve and empower them by giving them a choice to go to court instead of being forced into arbitration.

Survivors like Susan Fowler who, in 2015, was working with Uber when her manager started sexually harassing her. She immediately reported this to human resources, but when she did, her manager threatened to fire her. And since Uber employees are forced to sign arbitration agreements when they are hired, preventing them from bringing sexual harassment claims to court, Susan was forced into a confidential dispute forum without the right to appeal.

Three years later, Susan had had enough and she spoke out, writing in an op-ed for the New York Times: "From the systemic culture of harassment and discrimination at Uber . . . to the ubiquitous stories of women taken advantage of in industries ranging from professional football to restaurants, we have seen one company after another publicly outed and shamed for illegal treatment of employees."

And Susan rightly asks, "The question is no longer whether mistreatment actually occurs . . . but what can we do to ensure that it never happens again."

The answer is simple. We can pass this bipartisan legislation, end the practice of forced arbitration, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

□ 1745

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for her great work here in the Congress and for yielding time.

Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation. We all know that sexual assault and harassment are as wrong as wrong can be. Victims of sexual harassment and sexual assault must have their claims heard. They must never be silenced or intimidated into silence. But the outrage we rightly feel on behalf of these victims does not mean we should rush to pass a bill that could leave many of them worse off.

In the Judiciary Committee, we heard from experts about why this bill's approach is misguided. For example, some of the bill's supporters repeatedly claim that arbitration is what keeps victims from publicizing their experiences or going to authorities and law enforcement. But arbitration is not automatically secret or otherwise confidential.

Agreeing to resolve a case outside of court is different from agreeing to silence. Arbitration does not prevent anyone from speaking out. Anyone who has agreed to arbitrate may still go to authorities and law enforcement to report the wrongdoing, and well they should.

There is an important distinction between agreeing to arbitrate and agreeing to silence. This distinction matters because much of the push for this legislation comes from concerns about secrecy rather than from an honest assessment of whether arbitration advances justice. Yet despite the focus on secrecy, the text of this bill never actually addresses confidentiality or non-disclosure agreements.

Another key talking point for supporters of this legislation is that it gives plaintiffs more choice over how to resolve disputes, but that is not how arbitration works.

Giving one party the unilateral ability to cancel a two-way agreement to arbitrate will functionally take the option to arbitrate completely off the table. For one thing, contracts will be far less likely to include an option to arbitrate in the first place now. For another, we know that if parties can't agree in advance to arbitrate, then they are unlikely to agree to arbitrate after there has been a dispute. As a result, the plaintiff may never get to arbitration.

More often than not, victims do not have deep pockets or the potential for large-sum litigation settlements like those that are available to high-profile figures. This bill will cause these

women to lose the potential benefits of arbitration.

Lawsuits are normally long and costly, and companies often have enough money to vigorously defend these claims. These lawsuits are an ordeal for victims who, in a normal case, must undergo discovery, give depositions, and may even need to give public testimony. The rules of litigation may make it much harder for victims to tell their stories in their own words and get the relief they deserve.

Arbitration can be a welcomed alternative to the rigors and trauma of litigation, but Democrats want to pretend that this bill won't limit access to arbitration for victims of assault.

In reality, the bill is more about empowering the trial bar than actual victims. As drafted, the text gives trial lawyers every incentive to craft complaints and allege sexual harassment or assault to get whole cases out of arbitration and into court.

Ultimately, this bill will empower the plaintiffs' bar in ways that some of its supporters may not intend but that Democrats and trial lawyers certainly do.

For years, Democrats have pursued plaintiffs' lawyers' wish to gut arbitration agreements for all kinds of different claims. If Democrats and the trial bar had their way, everyone from consumers of financial services, to civil rights plaintiffs, to those with anti-trust claims and others would be forced into court even if they would rather agree to arbitrate at the outset.

Don't be fooled. What is best for plaintiffs' lawyers is not always what is best for plaintiffs.

Let's ensure whatever legislative vehicle we use actually makes things better. I am very concerned about this legislation and how it will actually play out for victims in practice and for the adverse consequences it could have.

Madam Speaker, for those reasons, I would urge that we oppose the bill.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, we must consider the unintended consequences of H.R. 4445. This bill has good intentions. We all want to help victims of sexual harassment, but this bill is not going to accomplish that. There are many policy concerns in this piece of legislation.

I want to say again: What we have before us today is that Congress is changing existing and agreed-to contracts. I have real concerns about government retroactively nullifying existing contractual agreements.

If H.R. 4445 becomes law, contracts will be far less likely to include any option to arbitrate. This is a concern for victims who do not have the resources to pursue high-dollar settlements. We must also keep in mind that sometimes arbitration is the best way to solve disputes.

Arbitration does not void an individual's constitutional rights under the Seventh Amendment. This is just one of the many, many aspects of this bill that needs to be reconsidered before we can confidently move forward.

Madam Speaker, I oppose this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same until we address the concerns surrounding this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 4445, the Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act, removes barriers to justice for survivors of sexual assault or sexual harassment by giving them a real choice of whether to go to court or to arbitrate their claim after the dispute has arisen.

Mr. JORDAN is right. Many such victims, if given the choice, will choose to go to court. Why shouldn't they? In arbitration, they lose 98 percent of the cases. The employer wins 98 percent of the cases in arbitration. Why? Well, for one thing, the employer picks the arbitrator, and the arbitrator is paid. So, naturally, the arbitrator wants to rule in such a way that he or she is likely to get hired again.

But 98 percent of the cases brought by women who have been sexually harassed who are in forced arbitration are lost by them. That is why this bill is necessary.

If we want to give women who have been sexually harassed a fair chance at justice, we must pass this bill. If we want to give women who have been sexually harassed a fair chance at winning against their employer who did the sexual harassment or allowed the sexual harassment, we must pass this bill.

That is why this critical measure is supported by a broad coalition of public interest organizations, including the National Alliance to End Sexual Violence, the National Center on Domestic and Sexual Violence, the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, the National Partnership for Women and Families, RAINN, and many others.

Not one single group that deals with sexual violence opposes this bill. Only employer organizations oppose this bill because it stacks the deck in their favor.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues, Representatives BUSTOS, GRIFFITH, JAYAPAL, and BUCK, for their leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I will vote "yes" on H.R. 4445, Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act of 2021. However, I have reservations that certain provisions in the bill lack clarity regarding key issues.

Employers have increasingly relied on forced arbitration clauses to circumvent work-

ers' right to due process. Currently, over 60 million American workers are locked out of the courtroom due to these coercive arrangements that compel them to go through a process that is rigged against them. Forced arbitration undermines workers' recourse for a wide array of employment law violations—not just sexual harassment and sexual assault; this includes wage theft and other employment discrimination issues. With Chairman NADLER, I introduced the Restoring Justice for Workers Act, H.R. 4841, a more comprehensive approach to protect workers' access to the courts and their right to collective action no matter their workplace claim.

Although H.R. 4445 is an important step forward by ensuring that certain individuals who experience "sexual assault" and "sexual harassment" are not forced to arbitrate their cases based on a pre-dispute arbitration agreement, I have concerns that the legislation does not go far enough to offer such protections to other vulnerable individuals who need fair access to the courts to vindicate their rights. In the employment context, for example, the bill's singular focus on sexual harassment involving unwelcome sexual advances, propositions, and sexual attention, fails to account for the other, harmful, and common, forms of sex-based harassment that occurs in the workplace. This kind of harassment is not sexual in nature but is motivated by a sex-based animus or hostility. It can involve offensive and derogatory comments about women working in male-dominated industries, physically intimidating conduct directed at men who fail to conform to stereotypical gender norms, as well as posting demeaning and graphic texts and images to make women or men feel uncomfortable in the workplace. These are just a few examples of the non-sexual, sex-based harassment that have been recognized by the Supreme Court and the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), the federal agency that enforces employment civil rights laws. Thus, given the breadth and complexity of sex-based harassment, and the negative impact it can have on individuals who experience it, I have concerns about limiting this bill to a certain type of sexual harassment.

I have similar concerns about the narrow scope of individuals who are included under the bill's definition of "sexual harassment dispute." The bill states that "the term 'sexual harassment dispute' means a dispute relating to . . . conduct directed at an individual or group of individuals." The phrase "directed at" suggests that the individual or group of individuals must be the target of the harassing conduct to be included in the bill's jurisdiction. In the employment context, however, the EEOC and federal courts have recognized that a harassment victim does not have to be the target of the harassment to have a viable harassment case. A salient example of this scenario is a female employee who works in an environment where male co-workers frequently use gender-derogatory language to describe or insult women, even though the language is not "directed at" the female employee. In such a scenario, the female employee could assert that she experienced sexual harassment because even though she was not the direct target of her male co-workers' gender-derogatory language, she worked in a sexually offensive and hostile environment. Therefore, using language in H.R. 4445 that seems to narrow the

scope of harassment victims to only those who are the direct target of harassing conduct undercuts this important principle.

I am encouraged that a group of bipartisan Members have introduced an amendment that recognizes some of the limitations of H.R. 4445's definition of "sexual harassment dispute." This amendment "[c]larifies that, for the purposes of the bill, sexual harassment dispute is defined as a dispute relating to conduct that allegedly constitutes sexual harassment under applicable Federal, Tribal, or State sexual harassment laws." By embracing sexual harassment jurisprudence, which encompasses a broader array of harassing conduct than is currently included in the text of the bill, the amendment would allow more sexual harassment victims to avoid forced arbitration of their cases based on a pre-dispute arbitration agreement.

Unfortunately, this bipartisan amendment does not address one of the most problematic issues with H.R. 4445—the lack of clarity regarding the coverage of intersectional and related issues that arise in sexual harassment cases. For example, in the workplace, minority women frequently experience sexual harassment concurrent with harassment based on their race or national origin. Additionally, a harassment victim may experience other negative employment actions related to the sexual harassment such as a demotion, unfavorable job transfer, reduction in pay, or other retaliatory conduct. The language in H.R. 4445 fails to specifically state whether there is coverage of these cases, i.e., whether intersectional cases and negative employment action cases related to the sexual harassment would go to court as one case or whether these cases would have to be bifurcated such that the sexual harassment case would go to court, but the intersectional and related case would be forced into arbitration. Given that bifurcation of these cases will only lead to unnecessary expense and an administrative burden for both parties, the best reading of the language in the bill that refers to "a case . . . [that] relates to a sexual harassment dispute" is that it was meant to encompass these scenarios. Any other reading of the text regarding these issues would lead to an impractical result, but regrettably the bill, as drafted, does not foreclose that possibility.

The final issue I want to address is the legislation's failure to include a notice requirement directing entities, such as employers, to inform the recipients of their pre-dispute agreements that they have certain protections related to forced arbitration. Typically, employers include language about an arbitration agreement in employment applications, contracts, and/or handbooks that is inconspicuous and difficult for a lay person to understand. For workers to know their rights, employers should be required to provide written, conspicuous notice of the protections in this bill, drafted in plain language the workers can understand, wherever the employer mentions a pre-dispute agreement to arbitrate, and prior to the employer's commencement of arbitration proceedings. Had these simple notice requirements been included in this legislation, it would have helped to ensure that "sexual assault" and "sexual harassment" victims received the full measure of protections under this bill.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, as a senior member of the House and the Committee on Homeland Security, and as Chair of

the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4445, the Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act of 2021.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 4445, the Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act of 2021, is bipartisan and bicameral legislation that empowers survivors of sexual assault and sexual harassment by giving them a choice to go to court instead of being forced into arbitration.

This legislation would amend the Federal Arbitration Act for disputes involving sexual assault and sexual harassment in order to stop employers and businesses from forcing employees and customers out of the court system and into arbitration.

It would ensure that predispute arbitration clauses and waivers of the right to bring joint actions in cases of sexual assault or sexual harassment would not be valid or enforceable for cases that are filed under Federal, Tribal, or State law.

Under current law, many employment and other contracts require binding arbitration for a wide range of matters before a dispute arises, which denies survivors the ability to decide whether to pursue their claim with the procedural protections provided by courts, and silences victims of abuse by forcing them into a confidential dispute forum without the right to appeal.

Madam Speaker, more than 60 million Americans are subject to mandatory arbitration clauses in the workplace, often without realizing it until they come forward to bring a claim against their employer.

The Report of the Co-Chairs of the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's Select Task Force on the Study of Harassment in the Workplace notes that between 50–75 percent of women have faced some form of unwanted or unwelcome sexual harassment in the workplace.

Additionally, contracts for services may include mandatory arbitration clauses in the fine print that shield companies and businesses from being held publicly accountable for the harm caused.

I support this necessary legislation because it advances efforts to prevent and address sexual harassment and sexual assault, strengthen rights, protect victims, and promote access to justice.

Madam Speaker, I strongly support this legislation and urge all Members to join me in voting for H.R. 4445, the Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act of 2021.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BUCK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 117–241.

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Beginning on page 2, strike line 21 and all that follows through line 10 on page 3, and insert the following:

(4) SEXUAL HARASSMENT DISPUTE.—The term “sexual harassment dispute” means a

dispute relating to conduct that is alleged to constitute sexual harassment under applicable Federal, Tribal, or State law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 900, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, this amendment is really very simple. It changes a somewhat convoluted definition of sexual harassment to the following: “The term ‘sexual harassment dispute’ means a dispute relating to conduct that is alleged to constitute sexual harassment under applicable Federal, Tribal, or State law.”

Simple, straightforward, understandable. The issue arose here because there was a question of whether the definition that was contained in this law would supersede Federal, State, or Tribal law; it doesn't. However, this clarifies that, and I would ask my colleagues to support this.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 45 seconds.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Antitrust, Commercial, and Administrative Law.

This amendment simply clarifies that H.R. 4445 does not amend current law outside of the Federal Arbitration Act. It reflects the bipartisan input of several of my colleagues in the House and Senate, including the bill's sponsor, Congresswoman BUSTOS.

Importantly, this amendment would protect the rights of survivors of sexual harassment by ensuring that they have a choice of litigating or arbitrating any case relating to the conduct that is alleged to constitute sexual harassment under applicable law. It does so by making clear that anything related to sexual harassment or assault as currently defined by law is covered by this bill.

This would include retaliation or any other misconduct that gives rise to the underlying claim alleging a violation of these laws and reflects an important compromise struck to protect these cases.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I am pleased with this amendment by the gentleman from

Colorado. It has my full support in the Judiciary Committee.

I also appreciate the chairman's non-opposition to the amendment. I believe it makes the bill better, and it makes the bill one that I am going to be eager and pleased to support.

The problem before was that the bill possibly made unenforceable arbitration agreements going well beyond sexual harassment disputes. But for sexual harassment disputes, I am in full agreement that the victim in every case should have the opportunity not to arbitrate, notwithstanding an arbitration agreement.

Therefore, this amendment succeeds. I am going to be glad to support the bill in full, and I am sure many others will as well.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS), the sponsor of the bill.

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, I am a proud co-lead of the amendment with Ranking Member KEN BUCK of Colorado.

This amendment is the result of good faith negotiations on an issue raised by Republicans on the House Judiciary Committee during debate on my bill, the Ending Forced Arbitration of Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Act.

We promised them that we would work to address those issues, and we did. I am glad we could reach an agreement to address their concerns about State and local laws.

This amendment and the underlying bill are a testament to what we can accomplish when we listen to each other and trust that we are working toward a common goal. In this case, that goal is protecting survivors of sexual assault and harassment and giving them a choice on how to pursue justice.

Madam Speaker, I thank Congressman BUCK for offering this amendment and working with us to address the concerns of his colleagues. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment.

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH), a cosponsor of this bill.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment.

As we just heard, this was the majority party taking into account the views of the minority party, which is why we have support on both sides of the aisle for this amendment.

This amendment will bring more Members of the minority party onto the bill. As one of the cosponsors of the bill, I think that is a good thing.

I think this is an appropriate amendment. I think it does clarify.

I commend Mrs. BUSTOS and Mr. BUCK for their hard work on this amendment. I ask that everyone vote for the amendment.

□ 1800

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA).



Mr. CORREA. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bill and the amendment.

Sex crimes, including sexual harassment, are some of the most brutal and heinous crimes, causing irreparable damage to their victims. Beyond the physical pain, the psychological trauma usually scars the victim for life. And let us not forget that the vast majority of victims bear this pain silently since these crimes usually go unreported.

I want to thank Mrs. BUSTOS for the bill and the amendments to prohibit forced arbitration when it comes to sexual assault. But I say to you, Madam Speaker, this is not enough. We must also address secret settlements and nondisclosure agreements. These agreements allow sexual predators to continue to victimize other victims for a long, long time.

To remedy this loophole, I will be introducing legislation to prohibit secret settlements when it comes to sexual crimes.

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for the opportunity.

This is nothing short of profound; the impact it is going to have on 60 million Americans who don't even know that they have agreed to forced arbitration and the fact that in 98 percent of the cases of sexual assault and sexual harassment in the workplace, the employer wins.

We had a hearing last week in which the NFL staffers at the Washington Commanders talked about the sexual harassment and sexual assault that they endured. One of them said in the year and a half that she worked there, she was sexually harassed every single day.

Let me speak about Loretta Lee of California who was fired from Google after complaining about male coworkers making lewd remarks, sending her disturbing messages, hiding under her desk, and showing up at her apartment. In addition to losing her right to file suit, she was also forced to meet with her perpetrators, resulting in retaliation.

Representative BUSTOS has done a great service to men and women who are sexually harassed and sexually assaulted in the workplace. I commend her, and I applaud her.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote for this amendment and for the legislation.

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, in closing, I thank Mr. BUCK for offering this helpful amendment.

I thank Ms. SPEIER, and I thank all the people who have been so helpful on this bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership, and I appreciate Mrs. BUSTOS and her willingness to consider this language. I don't know that there was a problem beforehand, but whatever there was, it has been cleared up, and I very much think that this is a stronger bill as a result of this amendment.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. JORDAN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of H.R. 4445 is postponed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1281. An act to name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Gaylord, Michigan, as the "Navy Corpsman Steve Andrews Department of Veterans Affairs Health Care Clinic".

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2159. An act to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 400 College Drive, Middleburg, Florida, as the "Andrew K. Baker Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic", and for other purposes.

S. 3527. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to transfer the name of property of the Department of Veterans Affairs designated by law to other property of the Department.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 117-81, the Chair, on behalf of the Ranking Member of the Armed Services Committee, appoints the following individual to serve as a member of the Commission on Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution Reform:

Ellen M. Lord of North Carolina.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 117-81, the Chair, on behalf of the Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, appoints

the following individual to serve as a member of the Commission on Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution Reform:

Robert F. Hale of Virginia.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 117-81, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, appoints the following individual to serve as a member of the Commission on Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution Reform:

Arun A. Seraphin of New York.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 117-81, the Chair, on behalf of the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, appoints the following individual to serve as a member of the Commission on Planning, Programming, Budgeting, and Execution Reform:

Jennifer Santos of Virginia.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106-567, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, announces the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Public Interest Declassification Board:

Alissa M. Starzak of the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 116-260, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, announces the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the People-to-People Partnership for Peace Fund Advisory Board:

The Honorable Angela Warnick of New York.

#### CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE SITUATION IN AND IN RELATION TO BURMA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 117-89)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622 (d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the situation in and in relation to Burma declared in Executive Order 14014 of February 10, 2021, is to continue in effect beyond February 10, 2022.

The situation in and in relation to Burma, and in particular the February

1, 2021 coup, in which the military overthrew the democratically elected civilian government of Burma and unjustly arrested and detained government leaders, politicians, human rights defenders, journalists, and religious leaders, thereby rejecting the will of the people of Burma as expressed in elections held in November 2020 and undermining the country's democratic transition and rule of law, continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 14014 with respect to Burma.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, February 7, 2022.

### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1831

### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. MANNING) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

### ENDING FORCED ARBITRATION OF SEXUAL ASSAULT AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4445) to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration of disputes involving sexual assault and sexual harassment will now resume.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BUCK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on amendment No. 1, printed in part B of House Report 117-241, on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 427, nays 0, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 32]

YEAS—427

Adams	Armstrong	Balderson
Aderholt	Auchincloss	Banks
Aguilar	Axne	Barr
Allen	Babin	Barragán
Allred	Bacon	Bass
Amodei	Baird	Beatty

Bentz	Eshoo	Kim (CA)	Peters	Scott (VA)	Tlaib
Bera	Estes	Kim (NJ)	Pfluger	Scott, Austin	Tonko
Bergman	Evans	Kind	Phillips	Scott, David	Torres (CA)
Beyer	Fallon	Kinzinger	Pingree	Sessions	Torres (NY)
Bice (OK)	Feenstra	Kirkpatrick	Pocan	Sewell	Trahan
Biggs	Ferguson	Krishnamoorthi	Porter	Sherman	Trone
Bilirakis	Fischbach	Kuster	Posey	Sherrill	Turner
Bishop (GA)	Fitzgerald	Kustoff	Pressley	Simpson	Underwood
Bishop (NC)	Fitzpatrick	LaHood	Price (NC)	Sires	Upton
Blumenauer	Fleischmann	LaMalfa	Quigley	Slotkin	Valadao
Blunt Rochester	Fletcher	Lamb	Raskin	Smith (MO)	Van Drew
Boebert	Fortenberry	Lamborn	Reed	Smith (NE)	Van Duyne
Bonamici	Poster	Langevin	Reschenthaler	Smith (NJ)	Vargas
Bost	Foxx	Larsen (WA)	Rice (NY)	Smith (WA)	Veasey
Bourdeaux	Frankel, Lois	Larson (CT)	Rice (SC)	Smucker	Vela
Bowman	Franklin, C.	Latta	Rodgers (WA)	Soto	Velázquez
Boyle, Brendan F.	Scott	LaTurner	Rogers (AL)	Spanberger	Wagner
Brooks	Fulcher	Lawrence	Rogers (KY)	Spartz	Walberg
Brown (MD)	Gaetz	Lawson (FL)	Rose	Speier	Walorski
Brown (OH)	Gallagher	Lee (CA)	Rosendale	Stansbury	Waltz
Brownley	Galleo	Lee (NV)	Ross	Stanton	Wasserman
Buchanan	Garamendi	Leger Fernandez	Rouzer	Staubert	Schultz
Buck	Garbarino	Lesko	Roy	Steel	Waters
Bucshon	Garcia (CA)	Letlow	Roybal-Allard	Stefanik	Watson Coleman
Budd	Garcia (IL)	Levin (CA)	Ruiz	Steil	Weber (TX)
Burchett	Garcia (TX)	Levin (MI)	Ruppersberger	Steube	Webster (FL)
Bush	Gibbs	Lieu	Rush	Stevens	Welch
Bustos	Gimenez	Lofgren	Rutherford	Stewart	Wenstrup
Butterfield	Gohmert	Long	Ryan	Strickland	Westerman
Calvert	Golden	Loudermilk	Salazar	Suozzi	Wexton
Cammack	Gomez	Lowenthal	Sánchez	Swalwell	Wild
Carbajal	Gonzales, Tony	Lucas	Sarbanes	Takano	Williams (GA)
Cárdenas	Gonzalez (OH)	Luetkemeyer	Scalise	Taylor	Williams (TX)
Carey	Gonzalez,	Luria	Scanlon	Tenney	Wilson (SC)
Carl	Vicente	Lynch	Schakowsky	Thompson (CA)	Wittman
Carson	Good (VA)	Mace	Schiff	Thompson (MS)	Womack
Carter (GA)	Gooden (TX)	Malinowski	Schneider	Thompson (PA)	Yarmuth
Carter (LA)	Gosar	Malliotakis	Schrader	Tiffany	Young
Carter (TX)	Gottheimer	Maloney,	Schrier	Timmons	Zeldin
Cartwright	Granger	Carolyn B.	Schweikert	Titus	
Case	Graves (LA)	Maloney, Sean			
Casten	Graves (MO)	Mann	Arrington	Burgess	Mooney
Castor (FL)	Green (TN)	Manning	Brady	Espallat	Wilson (FL)
Castro (TX)	Green, Al (TX)	Massie			
Cawthorn	Greene (GA)	Mast			
Chabot	Griffith	Matsui			
Cheney	Grijalva	McBath			
Cherfilus-	Grothman	McCarthy			
McCormick	Guest	McCaul			
	Guthrie	McClain			
	Hagedorn	McClintock			
	Harder (CA)	McCollum			
	Harris	McEachin			
	Harshbarger	McGovern			
	Hartzler	McHenry			
	Hayes	McKinley			
	Hern	McNerney			
	Herrrell	Meeks			
	Herrera Beutler	Meijer			
	Hice (GA)	Meng			
	Higgins (LA)	Meuser			
	Higgins (NY)	Mfume			
	Hill	Miller (IL)			
	Himes	Miller (WV)			
	Hinson	Miller-Meeks			
	Hollingsworth	Moolenaar			
	Horsford	Moore (AL)			
	Houlahan	Moore (UT)			
	Hoyer	Moore (WI)			
	Hudson	Morelle			
	Huffman	Moulton			
	Huizenga	Mrvan			
	Issa	Mullin			
	Jackson	Murphy (FL)			
	Jackson Lee	Murphy (NC)			
	Jacobs (CA)	Nadler			
	Jacobs (NY)	Napolitano			
	Jayapal	Neal			
	Jeffries	Neguse			
	Johnson (GA)	Nehls			
	Johnson (LA)	Newhouse			
	Johnson (OH)	Newman			
	Johnson (SD)	Norcross			
	Johnson (TX)	Norman			
	Jones	O'Halleran			
	Jordan	Obernolte			
	Joyce (OH)	Ocasio-Cortez			
	Joyce (PA)	Omar			
	Kahele	Owens			
	Kaptur	Palazzo			
	Katko	Pallone			
	Keating	Palmer			
	Keller	Panetta			
	Kelly (IL)	Pappas			
	Kelly (MS)	Pascrell			
	Kelly (PA)	Payne			
	Khanna	Pence			
	Kildee	Perlmutter			
	Kilmer	Perry			

### NOT VOTING—6

□ 1903

Mr. CARBAJAL changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

### MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Bacon (Smith (NE))	Gonzalez, Vicente (Correa)	McCaul (Pfluger)
Baird (Bucshon)	Gosar (Gaetz)	McEachin (Wexton)
Bass (Takano)	Grijalva (García (IL))	Meeks (Jeffries)
Bera (Correa)	Hagedorn (Carl)	Moore (UT)
Bowman (Jeffries)	Huffman (Gomez)	Letlow (Moore (WI))
Boyle, Brendan F. (Beyer)	Jacobs (CA)	Raskin (Raskin)
Brooks (Moore (AL))	Correa (Correa)	Napolitano (Correa)
Brownley (Meng)	Kahele (Case)	Payne (Pallone)
Carter (LA)	Keating (Cicilline)	Pingree (Bonamici)
(Kelly (IL))	Kelly (PA)	Porter (Wexton)
Clarke (NY)	(Balderson)	Reed (Johnson (SD))
(Kelly (IL))	Khanna (Gomez)	Roybal-Allard (Correa)
Cohen (Beyer)	Kind (Beyer)	Ruiz (Correa)
Crist	Kinzinger	Rush (Kaptur)
(Wasserman)	(Herrera)	Ryan (Kaptur)
Schultz)	Beutler	Salazar (Miller-Meeks)
Cuellar (Correa)	Kirkpatrick (Pallone)	Schneider (Rice (NY))
DeSaulnier	Kuster	Sewell (Cicilline)
(Raskin)	(Bonamici)	Sires (Pallone)
DesJarlais	Larson (CT)	Soto (Wasserman Schultz)
(Fleischmann)	(Cicilline)	Stanton (Bonamici)
Doggett (Raskin)	Lawson (FL)	Strickland (Takano)
(Evans)	(Evans)	Suozzi (Raskin)
Doyle, Michael F. (Evans)	Levin (MI)	Vargas (Correa)
(Raskin)	(Raskin)	Waters (Jeffries)
Dunn (Joyce (PA))	Lofgren (Jeffries)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Fallon (Ellzey)	Long	
Frankel, Lois (Meng)	(Fleischmann)	
Garamendi (Correa)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	
Gonzalez (OH)	Lucas (Bice (OK))	
(Balderson)	(OK))	
	Malinowski (Pallone)	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 335, nays 97, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—335

Adams	Curtis	Jeffries
Aguilar	Davidson (KS)	Johnson (GA)
Allen	Davis, Danny K.	Johnson (OH)
Allred	Dean	Johnson (SD)
Amodi	DeFazio	Johnson (TX)
Armstrong	DeGette	Jones
Auchincloss	DeLauro	Joyce (OH)
Axne	DelBene	Kahele
Balderson	Delgado	Kaptur
Banks	Demings	Katko
Barr	DeSaulnier	Keating
Barragán	Deutch	Keller
Bass	Diaz-Balart	Kelly (IL)
Beatty	Dingell	Kelly (MS)
Bera	Doggett	Kelly (PA)
Beyer	Doyle, Michael	Khanna
Bice (OK)	F.	Kildee
Biggs	Emmer	Kilmer
Bilirakis	Escobar	Kim (CA)
Bishop (GA)	Eshoo	Kim (NJ)
Bishop (NC)	Españat	Kind
Blumenauer	Evans	Kinzing
Blunt	Feenstra	Kirkpatrick
Bonamici	Ferguson	Krishnamoorthi
Bourdeaux	Fitzpatrick	Kuster
Bowman	Fleischmann	Kustoff
Boyle, Brendan	Fletcher	Lamb
F.	Fortenberry	Langevin
Brooks	Foster	Larsen (WA)
Brown (MD)	Frankel, Lois	Larsen (CT)
Brown (OH)	Gaetz	Latta
Brownley	Gallego	Lawrence
Buck	Garamendi	Lawson (FL)
Bucshon	Garbarino	Lee (CA)
Budd	Garcia (CA)	Lee (NV)
Burchett	Garcia (IL)	Leger Fernandez
Burgess	Garcia (TX)	Letlow
Bush	Gimenez	Levin (CA)
Bustos	Gohmert	Levin (MI)
Butterfield	Golden	Lieu
Calvert	Gomez	Lofgren
Carbajal	Gonzales, Tony	Loudermilk
Cárdenas	Gonzalez (OH)	Lowenthal
Carey	Gonzalez,	Lucas
Carson	Vicente	Luria
Carter (GA)	Gottheimer	Lynch
Carter (LA)	Granger	Mace
Cartwright	Graves (LA)	Malinowski
Case	Graves (MO)	Malliotakis
Casten	Green (TN)	Maloney,
Castor (FL)	Green, Al (TX)	Carolyn B.
Castro (TX)	Griffith	Maloney, Sean
Chabot	Grijalva	Manning
Cherfilus-	Guest	Matsui
McCormick	Guthrie	McBath
Chu	Harder (CA)	McCarthy
Cicilline	Harris	McCaul
Clark (MA)	Hartzler	McCollum
Clarke (NY)	Hayes	McEachin
Cleaver	Herrera Beutler	McGovern
Cloud	Hice (GA)	McHenry
Clyburn	Higgins (NY)	McKinley
Cohen	Hill	McNerney
Cole	Himes	Meeks
Comer	Hinson	Meijer
Connolly	Horsford	Meng
Cooper	Houlahan	Meuser
Correa	Hoyer	Mfume
Costa	Hudson	Miller-Meeks
Courtney	Huffman	Moore (UT)
Craig	Huizenga	Moore (WI)
Crenshaw	Jackson Lee	Morelle
Crist	Jacobs (CA)	Moulton
Crow	Jacobs (NY)	Mrvan
Cuellar	Jayapal	Mullin

Murphy (FL)	Ruiz	Takano
Murphy (NC)	Ruppersberger	Tenney
Nadler	Rush	Thompson (CA)
Napolitano	Ryan	Thompson (MS)
Neal	Salazar	Timmons
Neguse	Sánchez	Titus
Newhouse	Sarbanes	Tlaib
Newman	Scalise	Tonko
Norcross	Scanlon	Torres (CA)
Norman	Schakowsky	Torres (NY)
O'Halleran	Schiff	Trahan
Ocasio-Cortez	Schneider	Trone
Omar	Schrader	Underwood
Owens	Schrier	Upton
Pallone	Schweikert	Valadao
Panetta	Scott (VA)	Van Duyne
Pappas	Scott, David	Vargas
Pascarell	Sewell	Veasey
Payne	Sherman	Vela
Pelosi	Sherrill	Velázquez
Perlmutter	Simpson	Wagner
Peters	Sires	Walorski
Phillips	Slotkin	Waltz
Pingree	Smith (MO)	Wasserman
Pocan	Smith (NJ)	Schultz
Porter	Smith (WA)	Waters
Posey	Soto	Watson Coleman
Pressley	Spanberger	Webster (FL)
Price (NC)	Spartz	Welch
Quigley	Speier	Weston
Raskin	Stansbury	Wild
Reed	Stanton	Williams (GA)
Reschenthaler	Steel	Wilson (FL)
Rice (NY)	Stefanik	Wilson (SC)
Rice (SC)	Stevens	Wittman
Rodgers (WA)	Stewart	Womack
Rogers (KY)	Strickland	Yarmuth
Ross	Suozi	Zeldin
Roybal-Allard	Swalwell	

NAYS—97

Aderholt	Gallagher	Moore (AL)
Babin	Gibbs	Nehls
Bacon	Good (VA)	Obenolte
Baird	Gooden (TX)	Palazzo
Bentz	Gosar	Palmer
Bergman	Greene (GA)	Pence
Boebert	Grothman	Perry
Bost	Harshbarger	Pfizer
Brady	Hern	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Herrrell	Rose
Cammack	Higgins (LA)	Rosendale
Carl	Hollingsworth	Rouzer
Carter (TX)	Issa	Roy
Cawthorn	Jackson	Rutherford
Cheney	Johnson (LA)	Scott, Austin
Cline	Jordan	Sessions
Clyde	Joyce (PA)	Smith (NE)
Crawford	LaHood	Smucker
Davidson	LaMalfa	Staubert
Davis, Rodney	Lamborn	Steil
DesJarlais	LaTurner	Steube
Donalds	Lesko	Taylor
Duncan	Long	Thompson (PA)
Dunn	Luetkemeyer	Tiffany
Elizy	Mann	Turner
Estes	Massie	Van Drew
Fallon	Mast	Walberg
Fischbach	McClain	Weber (TX)
Fitzgerald	McClintock	Wenstrup
Fox	Miller (IL)	Westerman
Franklin, C.	Miller (WV)	Williams (TX)
Scott	Mooleenaar	Young
Fulcher		

NOT VOTING—2

Arrington Mooney

□ 1924

Mr. LATURNER changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. BARR, HICE of Georgia, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Bacon (Smith (NE))	Baird (Bucshon)	Bera (Correa)
	Bass (Takano)	

Bacon (Smith (NE))	Gonzalez, Vicente (Correa)	McEachin (Wexton)
Baird (Bucshon)	Gosar (Gaetz)	Meeks (Jeffries)
Bass (Takano)	Grijalva (García (IL))	Moore (UT)
Bera (Correa)	Hagedorn (Carl)	(Letlow)
Bowman (Jeffries)	Huffman (Gomez)	Moore (WI)
Boyle, Brendan	Jacobs (CA)	(Raskin)
F. (Beyer)	(Correa)	Napolitano (Correa)
Brooks (Moore (AL))	Kahele (Case)	Payne (Pallone)
Brownley (Meng)	Keating (Cicilline)	Pingree
Carter (LA)	Kelly (PA)	(Bonamici)
(Kelly (IL))	(Balderson)	Porter (Wexton)
Clarke (NY)	Khanna (Gomez)	Reed (Johnson (SD))
(Kelly (IL))	Kind (Beyer)	Reed (Johnson (SD))
Cohen (Beyer)	Kinzing	Roybal-Allard (Correa)
Crist	(Herrera Beutler)	Ruiz (Correa)
(Wasserman Schultz)	Kirkpatrick (Pallone)	Rush (Kaptur)
Cuellar (Correa)	Kuster (Bonamici)	Ryan (Kaptur)
DeSaulnier (Raskin)	Larson (CT)	Salazar (Miller-Meeks)
(Schultz)	(Cicilline)	Schneider (Rice (NY))
DesJarlais (Fleischmann)	Lawson (FL)	Sewell (Cicilline)
Doyle, Michael	(Evans)	Sires (Pallone)
F. (Evans)	Levin (MI)	Soto (Wasserman Schultz)
Dunn (Joyce (PA))	(Raskin)	Stanton
Españat	Lofgren (Jeffries)	(Bonamici)
(Jeffries)	Long	Strickland (Takano)
Fallon (Ellzey)	(Fleischmann)	Suozi (Raskin)
Wilson (FL)	Lowenthal (Beyer)	Vargas (Correa)
Frankel, Lois (Meng)	Lucas (Bice (OK))	Waters (Jeffries)
Garamendi (Correa)	Malinowski (Pallone)	Watson Coleman (Pallone)
Gonzalez (OH)	McCaul (Pfluger)	Wilson (FL)
(Balderson)		(Cicilline)

## MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF AMERICANS WHO HAVE PASSED AWAY FROM THE COVID-19 VIRUS

The SPEAKER. The Chair asks all Members in the Chamber, as well as Members and staff throughout the Capitol, to rise for a moment of silence in remembrance of more than 900,000 Americans who have passed away from the COVID-19 virus.

## PROMOTING RIGOROUS AND INNOVATIVE COST EFFICIENCIES FOR FEDERAL PROCUREMENT AND ACQUISITIONS ACT OF 2021

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 583) to promote innovative acquisition techniques and procurement strategies, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 426, nays 5, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 34]

YEAS—426

Adams	Babin	Bentz
Aderholt	Bacon	Baird
Aguilar	Baird	Bergman
Allen	Balderson	Beyer
Allred	Banks	Bice (OK)
Amodi	Barr	Bilirakis
Armstrong	Barragán	Bishop (GA)
Auchincloss	Bass	Bishop (NC)
Axne	Beatty	Blumenauer

THE BIPARTISAN INFRASTRUCTURE BILL AND THE ECONOMY

(Ms. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight how the bipartisan infrastructure law will accelerate last year's record job growth.

In Cleveland and Akron, more than 50 percent of roads have pavement in poor condition. The infrastructure law will help to repave these roads and reduce commute times. The law allows public transit agencies like the RTA and Akron Metro in my district to replace outdated vehicles, build new garages, and expand services.

Ohio has more lead pipes than almost every other State in the country. The infrastructure law will help to ensure every child and family in our region has access to safe drinking water. The law will expand access to safe drinking water, and the law will expand access to high-speed internet to the roughly 30 percent of Cleveland households that currently lack it.

These projects will create thousands of jobs across our State, jobs that come on the heels of last year's record economic job growth. In 2021, we had the greatest year of job creation in history. Unemployment is down, and wages are rising.

Make no mistake, the Biden agenda is creating jobs and delivering results, real results, for the people.

---

HONORING MS. IRENE ROBINSON

(Ms. LETLOW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LETLOW. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor a truly outstanding individual from Louisiana's Fifth District. For almost 50 years, Irene Robinson, known to so many of us as Ms. Irene, has been the radio voice of West Carroll Parish, using the airwaves to keep our rural communities informed about the latest news, weather, and events around town. In addition, she is a diehard football fan and spent her Friday nights as the beloved announcer for the Oak Grove Tigers.

Throughout her career, Ms. Irene ensured that her station, KWCL, was a community gathering place, highlighting some of the best in our region. Her love for family and for Louisiana, particularly her native West Carroll Parish, was always evident on the air.

Ms. Irene's late husband, Ivy, also served as her engineer, ensuring that her broadcasts were always a family affair. I can tell you that the sense of family also extended to her guests as well.

Madam Speaker, we are honored to celebrate Ms. Irene Robinson for her many contributions in northeast Louisiana, we recognize the incredible legacy she leaves behind, and wish her

well in her retirement after decades of service to our region.

#### RECOGNIZING SEWA DIWALI

(Ms. SHERRILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SHERRILL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sewa Diwali for their work supporting communities in need in NJ-11 and across the country.

Their mission is to bring people together, foster commitment to selfless giving, and embody the spirit of Diwali. They do this through organizing food collections and other donation drives.

In my district, New Jersey-11, I have joined Sewa for multiple food drives and community events. Sewa donated 1,700 pounds of food to the Morris Plains food pantry and 2,400 pounds to Parsippany food pantry in 2021 alone. The enthusiasm toward doing good and giving back to the community Sewa brings to our towns is truly heartwarming.

Nationally in 2021, they collected 590,000 pounds of food which provided an estimated 491,000 meals throughout 31 States and 200 townships.

I want to thank every volunteer who has aided Sewa in helping so many of our neighbors, friends, and families. I look forward to seeing and being a part of the good they will do in 2022.

#### LIBERTY COUNTY KIWANIS CLUB

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the establishment of a new Kiwanis Club in the First District's Liberty County.

Kiwanis Clubs across the country are known for making it their mission to improve their respective communities through engagement of our youth. Liberty County's chapter is no exception. It is through their incredible dedication to our community that the Kiwanis Club of Liberty County aims to improve the lives of every citizen around them.

Our youth are our future, and the drive already exhibited by this chapter has blessed us with a bright one through strong youth engagement. We are incredibly grateful for all that they have planned, and we know that they will be an asset to Georgia's First District.

It is moments like these that make me extraordinarily proud to represent a district that is so motivated to improve the lives of their neighbors.

I thank the Liberty County Kiwanis Club leadership, Mayor Allen Brown of Hinesville, Chairman Donald Lovett of Liberty County, and others for joining me in recognizing these fantastic people.

Every day we work to ensure a better future, and the Kiwanis Club of Liberty

County is helping us to guarantee just that.

#### RACISM IS UNACCEPTABLE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, the head of the NFL said that racism of any kind is unacceptable.

Having worked on these issues since the very beginning of my tenure in the United States Congress, including hearings in Houston on brain injuries that were undiagnosed, I take a special interest in the Brian Flores lawsuit for the reality that it means something is wrong and it must be changed.

Yesterday, I honored a Houston Texan who had a great history. Today, as I tweeted early this morning, the vacancy should be filled by Lovie Smith, an African American, a coach for the Houston Texans. Later today they announced that Lovie Smith will be the new coach. With experience having taken the Chicago team to the Super Bowl, could it be anyone else?

Now, we need to begin to assess how we can act on the words "racism is unacceptable" in any sport in any part of America's life.

I am excited. Congratulations to Coach Smith and to the Houston Texans. But let us acknowledge David Culley and go forward so that the example can be across the landscape of sports wherever it is and across the Nation.

#### REMEMBERING SERGEANT CHRIS JENKINS

(Mr. BURCHETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight with a heavy heart as the citizens of my district and, especially, Loudon County mourn the loss of Sergeant Chris Jenkins, a military veteran and long-time member of the Loudon County Sheriff's Office.

Sergeant Jenkins was killed last week. He was hit by an intoxicated driver behind the wheel of a semitruck. His life was cut way too short, but the impact he had on his community will live on long into the future.

Sergeant Jenkins served with honor, proudly going to work every day in service to others and knowing that any day he could be asked to make the ultimate sacrifice.

Today, I had the privilege of speaking on the phone with Sergeant Jenkins' sweet mother, Faye, and his son Clay, who is also a Loudon County Sheriff's deputy. Many of my friends in the Chamber know that those are the hardest calls to make.

To me, our servicemembers and first responders are all heroes. But talking to mothers like Faye, Madam Speaker, you are reminded that these heroes are so much more: they are mothers and

fathers, sons and daughters, brothers and sisters.

So, Madam Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring the life and service of Sergeant Chris Jenkins and offer up a prayer tonight that his family find some comfort in their loss.

#### BUTLER COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE AT ARMSTRONG CAMPUS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, earlier this month I visited Butler County Community College at Armstrong campus. This community college is one of the six campuses in the BC3 community.

BC3 at Armstrong is the newest branch and opened to students in 2015. The college is currently preparing for an expansion which will spur economic growth and expand education access to underrepresented communities.

This 15,000-square-foot state-of-the-art facility will provide current and future students additional educational opportunities.

Students currently enrolled can take classes leading to an associate's degree in business administration, psychology, and general studies. With this expansion, BC3 at Armstrong plans to introduce noncredit workforce development opportunities as well as associate degree career programs in technical fields.

The educational paths provided by BC3 at Armstrong focus on learning to earn, ultimately equipping their students with the skills needed to enter the workforce immediately upon graduation.

It is the efforts of educational institutions like Butler County Community College that provide high-quality, affordable education, giving our next generation of learners more opportunities to succeed.

#### PUTIN AGGRESSION CATASTROPHIC TO RUSSIA

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, Putin continues threatening military aggression against Ukraine, now over 100,000 troops, which would only enrich Putin cronies and oligarchs, and which would be catastrophic for the people of Russia. A Putin invasion would result in needless and horrific loss of both Ukrainian and Russian lives.

Having returned from a recent delegation to Kyiv, I saw firsthand the courage of the people of Ukraine for independence.

Putin should know that both parties in America are united in support of the Ukrainian people. NATO is also unified as Chancellor Olaf Scholz promised today.

I am grateful that Biden has changed course to reinforce the Trump policies of sending defensive weapons to Ukraine.

Putin aggression against Ukraine must be deterred for the benefit of the people of Russia and the people of Ukraine.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, who successfully protected America for 20 years, as the global war on terrorism continues moving from a safe haven in Afghanistan to America.

□ 2000

#### ANALYZE TREATMENT PROTOCOLS FOR COVID-19

(Mr. GROTHMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I would like to address the COVID pandemic. A lot of people are kind of bored and tired of hearing about it, but with 2,000 lives lost a day, we shouldn't keep our eye off the ball.

It seems to be most of the focus or time spent is on masks, government shutdowns, and vaccines. But some doctors in my district feel that the treatment, once people get to the hospital, is to blame. I hope our special committee looks at the treatment people get in the hospital, analyzing remdesivir and its cost of well over \$3,000 a day, to ivermectin and hydroxychloroquine, together with the shortage of monoclonal antibodies.

Doctors in my district feel tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of lives could be saved if people were given something else once they got in the hospital. And just because that may not be as sexy or interesting, I think it is something our special subcommittee ought to take up and see if they can save some lives. It might take some standing up to the pharmaceutical industry.

#### BIDEN'S ENERGY CRISIS

(Mr. ROSE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, we are in the middle of the coldest season of the year, which means Tennesseans and Americans across the country are turning up their thermostats. Unfortunately, the price of staying warm has skyrocketed after 1 year under the Biden administration. Americans are paying an average of 32 percent more for their heating costs compared to last year.

Most households are paying between \$700 and \$1,700 more this year to heat their homes. This drastic rise in prices is not a shock to the Biden administration. Back in October, the U.S. Energy Information Administration predicted that this winter Americans would pay approximately 30 percent more for natural gas, which is the most common resource for heating our homes.

That prediction did not stop President Biden and far-left Democrats from pushing radical energy policies, such as pausing new oil and natural gas leases on public lands for several months, and implementing senseless restrictions on the oil and gas industry that decreased our Nation's overall supply.

President Biden needs to change his energy policies before we are plunged into an even deeper crisis.

#### THIN BLUE LINE MASK

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, this last week, a 13-year-old young man was verbally berated in his school classroom in Grass Valley, California, in my district, by a substitute math teacher, all because he was wearing a mask that had the thin blue line on it, which is known all over the country and internationally as being the one symbol that supports law enforcement.

The flag—it is an American flag adapted to that—is a sign that just shows support for our law enforcement, who we know protect us from chaos and anarchy, and they help uphold ideals of justice, freedom, bravery, and solidarity.

The boy's father and stepmother are members of law enforcement, so it is natural that he would be wearing that mask, not only in general for law enforcement but for his parents. Then we have a grown adult in a classroom setting who attacks this boy because he says he wants to compare this to the new Confederate flag. It is ridiculous. He berated a child.

We are all raised to respect law enforcement, and this is what is going on in the classroom. I commend the school district for not bringing that substitute teacher back anymore.

Hang in there young man and your parents.

#### HONORING CONGRESSWOMAN SHIRLEY CHISHOLM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BUSH). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on the subject of the Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank our Congressional Black Caucus chair, Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY,

for her tremendous leadership and for giving us this Special Order hour on behalf of the Congressional Black Caucus to honor my mentor, one of the founding members of the Congressional Black Caucus, the late Congresswoman Shirley Anita St. Hill Chisholm. And to Congresswoman BEATTY, I just want to say how proud we are, and how bold she has led this caucus by demanding that everyone really understand our power, and our message. Tonight is no exception. And, in fact, Congresswoman Chisholm, I am sure, is very proud of the leadership of Congresswoman BEATTY.

As the first African-American woman elected to Congress in 1968—I want you to listen to this—the first Congress convened in 1789 and the first Black woman elected to Congress was in 1968. That was Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm. She was also the first African American and woman to seek the Presidency.

Shirley Chisholm has truly cemented her place in history as a trailblazer. I first met Congresswoman Chisholm because of a college assignment at Mills College in Oakland, California. My government professor assigned us to do field work on a Presidential campaign.

At the time, several men were vying for the Democratic nomination, but they didn't speak to the issues that I cared about. I was a young, single mom on public assistance, and their platforms did not include issues that related to me or my community, like childcare, public education, universal healthcare, and ending poverty.

So, of course, even though I had never flunked a class in my life, I decided to get an F in this class because I could not bring myself to work for these candidates.

Now, I didn't believe these candidates could see me or had seen my community in terms of our needs. So I invited Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm to Mills College. I did not know she was running for the Presidency, but I invited her to address the Black Student Union because I was president of the Black Student Union. I had no idea she was running for President.

In her speech, she stood up for children and struggling working families. She spoke out against racism and sexism. She was against the Vietnam war. She advocated for what she knew was right, undeterred by criticism and without fear of the consequences.

As soon as she finished her speech, I went up to talk to her to tell her about this class I was about to flunk, and she took me to task. She asked me if I was registered to vote. And I said: No. I admitted that I wasn't going to do much in politics because I didn't believe in the two-party system and its relationship to my needs and my community.

She said: Little girl, you can't change the system if you are on the outside looking in. Register to vote. And from that moment on, I ended up working in her northern California



campaign. I vowed to listen to her, allowed her to mentor me and take me to task.

We organized her northern California campaign out of my class at Mills College, and the rest is history. I went on to Miami, Florida, as a Shirley Chisholm delegate and we took a large percentage of the vote in Alameda County.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. BEATTY), the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus to deliver, once again, our power and our message, and then I will return and yield to my colleagues after the chair of the Black Caucus speaks.

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Speaker, I thank our coanchor tonight, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE. I proudly join my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus to commemorate the unbought and unbossed legacy of Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm that lives on through each of us.

I would like to thank Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE for being our anchor of the Special Order hour, and yielding tonight to let Congresswoman BARBARA LEE open up this special session on Shirley Chisholm.

Before I make just a few brief remarks, let me just say, as we just heard Congresswoman BARBARA LEE say, as Shirley Chisholm referred to her as “that little girl,” oh, how proud she would be today knowing that little girl is now the woman that we say, “BARBARA LEE speaks for me.”

She is the woman that spearheaded putting Shirley Chisholm’s face on a stamp. And every day Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, through her stellar and magnificent leadership, guides us in the footsteps of Shirley Chisholm. Certainly, she is unbought and unbossed.

So to you, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, I say thank you for allowing us to stand on your shoulders. Thank you for when you walk in the room, whether it is steering in policy, whether it is Appropriations or any of the other committees, you always carry members with you. And that is what Shirley Chisholm has done for this Nation.

And so now, let me say what you will hear repeatedly tonight: The first Black woman elected to the United States Congress, you will hear that she is the first Black woman to seek nomination as President of these United States from one of the two major political powers. Certainly, she left us a legacy that lives on; a legacy that we are so proud of.

What I would like to say to everyone watching, Madam Speaker, especially for mothers and daughters, think of what it must have been like to stand in the Halls of justice where we are standing today, where she was standing alone. Think what it must have been like for her when she stood on that Democratic national floor at that convention, giving such a powerful speech, far ahead of her time when she held up those two fingers that we see so often, and that we today stand on her shoulders.

Lastly, Madam Speaker, it gives me a great privilege to walk these Halls of Congress and to be the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus. When I walk down the Halls of justice, I say to Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, that I think about standing on the shoulders of Barbara Jordan. I think about what it was like to have a Shirley Chisholm and a Barbara Jordan. But then, Madam Speaker, I know what it is like, it is having a BARBARA LEE and a SHEILA JACKSON LEE, and that is what tonight is about.

When I walk by that life-sized portrait of Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, I think about her courage. I think about her leadership. I think about what we will tell every little Black girl in America. You too can be a Shirley Chisholm. You too can stand up for justice. You too can be in the fight representing the people who need us the most.

In conclusion, I say the two most powerful words that I was taught to say, and that is thank you. Thank you to these Halls of Congress for letting us have a Shirley Chisholm. Thank you members of the Congressional Black Caucus for coming out tonight to honor her great legacy because it is not just about this Special Order hour tonight. It is about our future. It is about how we continue to live the legacy of Shirley Chisholm.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me first say to our chair that our power and our message is exactly what the gentlewoman has delivered tonight. And I just want to thank her for her very gracious remarks and just know that I know Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm is proud of her leadership and proud of the fact that although she was one in 1968, I believe we have—what—25 bold, brilliant Black women in the Congressional Black Caucus.

Thank you again for giving us a chance to honor her tonight and for your leadership.

I now yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JOHNSON), the chair of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology. I have been here since 1998, and she took to me and explained to me why, and I was on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology when I first came to Congress, and I learned so much from her and have really just honored her for helping us navigate as Black women in this institution.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman so very much for her comments. I am truly proud to stand tonight with our leader of this hour, as well as the leader of our Caucus to pay tribute to Shirley Chisholm.

Just a little over 50 years ago today, in a 1972 speech announcing her candidacy for President, Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm said:

I am not the candidate of Black America, although I am Black and proud.

I am not the candidate of the women’s movement of this country, although I am a woman, and I am equally proud of that.

I am the candidate of the people of America and my presence before you now symbolizes a new era in American political history.

□ 2015

Here was a Black woman from Brooklyn, New York, of Guyanese and Bajan descent, born to a burlap worker and a seamstress, boldly declaring a new era in American politics.

But despite her best efforts, Congresswoman Chisholm knew that the outcome of her candidacy was preordained.

At the time, our country was still learning to accept Black people and women as equal citizens—that is the year I was first elected to my first elected office—much less electing them as President of the United States.

Nevertheless, she persisted.

She held an unwavering faith in our common humanity, even when our common humanity did not hold the same faith in her. It was that same faith that drove her campaign.

She transcended political norms by bringing the issues of gender and racial equity to the national stage.

She highlighted and reinforced the importance of diversity at the table of public discourse.

And she shattered any preconceived notions about Black women in public service, particularly in politics.

Building on her work as the first Black woman elected to Congress, she blazed the trail and the torch of progress for many of us who have followed.

Today, the Congressional Black Caucus, which she helped establish, has 27 women from districts across the country. I think I speak on behalf of all of us when I say that we would not be here today if not for her life and legacy.

So as we celebrate Black History Month and the 50th anniversary of her Presidential campaign and the 51st anniversary of the Congressional Black Caucus, let Congresswoman Chisholm’s story serve as a reminder that equality and justice are the responsibility of every generation, and it is our turn.

Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the Congressional Black Caucus and our distinguished leader, BARBARA LEE, for offering us this opportunity.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank very much Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON for that powerful statement and also reminding us of her humble beginnings. She also, when she came to Congress, championed the rights of domestic workers and of low-income people. It was in her soul and in her spirit. She turned her vision into legislation here and was an excellent legislator who never lost touch with who she was.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), the co-chair of our Special Order, another greater leader from the State of Texas, and, as Chairwoman BEATTY said, a fighter for justice on a lot of fronts.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California, as always, for reminding us in almost every moment of her tenure here in the United States Congress of the spirit and the investment that Shirley Chisholm made in her personally and the investment that she made as a young college student, saying that I am going to find Shirley Chisholm or accept the call and be in her Presidential election. What a historic moment for her.

Also, the very pathway that she has taken in the United States Congress is evidence that she is definitely a living example of the fighting spirit of Shirley Chisholm.

It is great to be here to acknowledge this 50th commemoration of this historic moment. I thank our chair, the Honorable JOYCE BEATTY, for reminding us of Our Power, Our Message. I would like to say our message, our power, and to recognize that the Congressional Black Caucus is the pacesetter for justice and equality and the elimination of racism, which still lifts its head today.

To my other colleagues that are here today, I am grateful for their presence on the floor, for Shirley Chisholm deserves the recognition and the acknowledgment of who she was but also what she did and what she invested in America.

Let it be known that even as she was an African-American woman, she was a great American that made differences that can be seen today.

I want to honor and acknowledge the shoulders upon which I stand. That includes, in our Congress, Shirley Chisholm, John Conyers, John Lewis, Ron Dellums, and Barbara Jordan.

I also want to acknowledge my parents, Ivalita "Ivy" Jackson, a vocational nurse, and Ezra C. Jackson, one of the first African Americans to succeed in the aftermath of being discriminated against in the comic book industry.

All of that pours into the work of Shirley Chisholm and her campaign slogan in this, her congressional district race in 1968: "Fighting Shirley Chisholm: Unbought and Unbossed." That continued throughout her life.

She remarked that women in this country must become revolutionaries, that we must refuse to accept the old, traditional roles and stereotypes.

This is a sentiment that I take to heart myself and that the women of the Congressional Black Caucus have taken to heart. We have told the Nation that we must have self-determination. We want to lead. Shirley Chisholm was at the core of the movement of women leading. That is why, on January 25, 1972, Shirley announced her candidacy.

She stood before the cameras, and in the beginning of her speech, she said—before I say these words, let me be very clear. There weren't thousands of people. There may not have been hundreds and hundreds of people. I can tell you

there was a bounty of skeptics, people standing back and saying: This is unimaginable. Why would she do this? We don't need her to do this. She is getting in the way.

I am grateful that Shirley Chisholm, fighting Shirley Chisholm, unbought and unbossed, maintained the dignity of the right of a Black woman, an American, to run for the Presidency of the United States.

So, she said: "I stand before you today as a candidate for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency of the United States."

How sweet those words are.

"I am not the candidate of Black America, although I am Black and proud. I am not the candidate of the women's movement of this country, although I am a woman and I am equally proud of that. I am not the candidate of any political"—bosses—"or special interests. . . . I am the candidate of the people."

We keep that in mind, this Congress, the Democratic Members of Congress. The Congressional Black Caucus must keep in mind that we are the candidates, the spokespersons of the people, that it is their truth that we must tell. Shirley Chisholm always told their truth.

She did not win the nomination, but she went on to the Democratic Convention in Miami and received 151 votes.

We know that the Vice President of the United States, KAMALA HARRIS, stands on the shoulders of Shirley Chisholm. The women today that are elected across America, in all different positions, stand on the shoulders of Shirley Chisholm.

We recognize that barriers still stand. One that we hope will be corrected in this month, Black History Month, in Shirley Chisholm's fighting spirit, is that an African-American woman, a Black woman, will be nominated to the United States Supreme Court.

We want more than that as well. We want an age-old bill that has been languishing for so long, H.R. 40, the Commission to Study and Develop Reparation Proposals for African Americans Act, that Congresswoman Chisholm would have been on. We want it to be pronounced and announced this month.

As we honor her tonight, fighting Shirley Chisholm, let me acknowledge the different poses, the different leadership, as she has stood for the people of Brooklyn, but the people of America. That is the face of a fighting woman, and that is the face of the person we honor tonight.

I am delighted to be here with my colleague, who has always put Shirley Chisholm in the forefront of our thinking, of how progressive and innovative and powerful and strong and empowering—I want to leave you with that. She believed in empowering others and understood the words of Martin Luther King: Injustice anywhere is injustice everywhere. Shirley Chisholm was ahead of her time.

Shirley Chisholm is to be honored every day, as my colleague said, as we walk through these Halls. I look up and see Barbara Jordan, and then I look up and see Shirley Chisholm, unbought and unbossed. Honor her tonight and always.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank very much Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE for that very comprehensive statement about our shero, Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm. Congresswoman JACKSON LEE certainly is the epitome of who she was.

I am so happy that she raised some of the issues and some of her quotes because she told me personally: BARBARA, these rules and policies weren't made for you and I.

She said: Don't go along to get along.

She said: If you get behind these closed doors in any capacity, you have to fight to change the rules of the game. You have to fight the systemic issues. Don't tinker around the edges.

I say that because, once again, when I started, I mentioned the fact that the first Congress was held in 1789, right? Shirley Chisholm was elected in 1968. Our country lost so much during that period because there were no Black women right here in this House of Representatives.

We have to always remember the power of the moment when Shirley was elected to Congress and then running for President.

Congresswoman LUCY MCBATH, another trailblazer who has shattered a heck of a lot of glass ceilings, first of all, and who has been bold and determined and persistent in making her community and this country a better place, I am so glad that she is with us tonight.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia (Mrs. MCBATH).

Mrs. MCBATH. Madam Speaker, I want to thank so much my esteemed colleague BARBARA LEE, who speaks for me tonight, and also SHEILA JACKSON LEE. I thank them both so much for leading us in this commemoration tonight of our shero Shirley Chisholm. I am also grateful for the words that were spoken earlier by our leader, our shero of the Congressional Black Caucus, JOYCE BEATTY.

Black History Month is a time for us to commemorate all of those who came before us and to celebrate those who helped pave the path of progress that we find ourselves on today.

Shirley Chisholm is truly one of those trailblazers. She was a woman who lived her truth and told her story boldly time and time again. She was a trailblazer ahead of her time who had a deep and lasting impact on our communities, on our country, and, most specifically, on communities of color.

It is not hard today to see that very impact. We now have a new generation of leaders who are shaping the policy of this Nation's future, who looked to the past and continue to look to leaders like Shirley Chisholm to see all the

places we still need to go. Yes, we have a long way to go.

Young women around the world, and especially young women of color, have been forever inspired by her example, with all the barriers that she broke down. It can be easy to forget all that she did, all that she helped to build.

Shirley was instrumental in strengthening voting rights; she was a force in demanding women's rights; and she was a leader in the fight for civil rights.

It was the way that she worked all those years ago that has shown time and time again why we must continue these very same fights today.

In my home State of Georgia, we are at the forefront of the fight for voting rights once again. We are, again, fighting against attempts at the worst voter suppression we have seen since Jim Crow. At a time when our voting rights are under attack, we must once again lead in the efforts to protect these very sacred rights.

□ 2030

So, to all the women of color who have followed in Shirley's footsteps, the work you do has never been more important. The times have found us, and it is in these moments that we must continue to rise to this occasion. We have been prepared for this moment, a moment that beckons us to fight for equality and strive for justice, the equality and the justice that every one of us deserves.

That preparation is because of leaders like Shirley Chisholm, and now because the leaders of tomorrow grew up watching the leaders of yesterday, we will continue to make indelible marks on the world.

Because of women like Shirley Chisholm, women of color have found their own power to stand up and to speak out and to advocate for the change that we know is possible, but more so the change that we know is necessary.

So, as we continue to follow in the footsteps of the giants who came before us, as we honor and celebrate the titans of the movement, I want to thank each and every person who wakes up every day in this country and does this work. Because this work is not easy, but changes only ever come from those who have brought their lived experiences into these Halls of power.

For all of you in this Chamber, for the brave Black women who have carried this country forward, I want to say to each of you, I want to say that the work that you are doing as women and as women of color has never been more important. I want to thank you from the bottom of my heart because I would not be here had it not been for you.

I want to say how proud I am of each of your accomplishments, of your triumphs, and your successes, and I want you to remember that we are all doing the best that we can and that each day God continues to give us new grace.

As we move forward, we must be courageous in the fight for justice, human

rights, and a future that celebrates the diversity and the power of who we are as a people.

We should all strive to extend the path that Shirley helped build for us to follow. We should all strive to be like Shirley and be our best.

Ms. LEE of California. Congresswoman LUCY MCBATH, I would like to share a story with you which reminds me of you that happened during Shirley's campaign because I know your district, and I know how you fight each and every day to bring people together, and how you care about all people, humanity.

You care about people regardless of party affiliation, regardless of background, and I know that is how you do your work, and that is how you are so effective as a Black woman.

During Shirley Chisholm's campaign, George Wallace was running for President also. He was shot and he was hospitalized. He was paralyzed. This is in the middle of the campaign. Congresswoman Chisholm suspended her campaign for a few days, and she went to visit that segregationist George Wallace.

I mean, I was ready to leave. I said no, there is no way that my first campaign, this hero—shero of mine is going down to see this man who has blocked African Americans from going to school, who has sicced dogs on them, who is a horrible human being.

And so I talked to her and said, "I can't deal with this, Mrs. Chisholm." I was so angry for that decision. And I am thinking of Congresswoman MCBATH now, I am thinking of the context in which we live in terms of so much hate out there because she said to me, she said, "Little girl," even though I was a grown woman with two little kids, "Remember, we are all human beings. Maybe I can teach him something and help him regain his humanity."

I said, "Well, he never had any. He was a bad man."

And she went on to say, "I know you are angry. I know people are really angry who support me, but you have to rise to the occasion if you are a leader, and you have to try to break down some of these barriers. You have to break through and try to enlighten other people who may hate you."

I said, "No, that is not good enough. He will never, ever come around, and I am really angry." But she asked me to stay on with her campaign, so I begrudgingly did.

But what happened was she was able—and I am a good friend with George Wallace's daughter, Peggy Wallace Kennedy, who is a fighter for racial justice, who is a phenomenal woman in Alabama, and she is a good friend of mine, and she told me just recently, she said, "Honey, you know, I was at that bedside when Shirley Chisholm visited my daddy, and she talked to him, and she told him what terrible things he had done, and she asked him to please, please, please understand

that Black people deserved justice and equality."

And she didn't know whether she was making an impact on him or not, but later—I still say too little, too late—he went to Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in his wheelchair and rolled down the aisle and apologized for all of his misdeeds.

They became friends from afar, and he got a lot of the Southern Members to sign onto her legislation for domestic workers and for all of her bills that she was working on that she needed Southern Dixiecrats to support.

I share that story now because that seems like something that we forgot how to do. I mean, I know I have. It is something that she taught me because not only was she responsible for this apology—again, too little too late—but it showed me that you have got to step out of your comfort zone, like you do, and hopefully, hopefully see some good in people who are your adversaries.

You were talking, and I wanted to share that because I was personally involved with that story. I want to salute Peggy Wallace Kennedy tonight because she has really led a life that has been a life of making sure that every barrier against African Americans and people of color is dismantled in this country. Thank you again.

Mrs. MCBATH. Thank you for sharing that.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, we will go to another fighter who has just come here from the great State of Ohio, who has a remarkable record fighting for voting rights and justice and is a woman who serves her community in ways that every Member of Congress should serve their community, Congresswoman SHONTEL BROWN, who I think has been here for years now, but she has really hit the ground running in her presence on this floor.

Ms. BROWN of Ohio. Thank you to the co-leaders, BARBARA LEE and SHEILA JACKSON LEE, my sisters and colleagues.

Madam Speaker, as we celebrate Black History Month, I rise today to join my CBC colleagues and my CBC sisters in honoring the life and trailblazing legacy of Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm.

Before me, it was her. Before my predecessor, HUD Secretary Marcia Fudge, it was her. Before the record-setting number of 27 Black women in Congress today, it was her.

My career in public service rests on the shoulders and the contributions of the iconic Shirley Chisholm. In 1969 she became a political pioneer and shattered racial and gender barriers by becoming the first Black woman elected to Congress.

Her signature slogan, "unbought and unbossed," spoke to her audacity, her sheer sense of will, and her fearlessness in the face of established norms and institutions. And it spoke to her rise as the people's politician, someone willing to speak up and speak out for those embattled by poverty, discrimination, and injustice.

In Congress, she fought for low-income families, for hungry schoolchildren, and for single moms. She was critical to the creation of the national school lunch program. She was critical to the growth of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, known as SNAP, and she was critical to the creation of the Women, Infants, and Children's program, known as WIC. Then, as now, these programs reduce the hunger facing American children and families. Today I am proud to carry forth her legacy by fighting for their expansion.

Fifty years ago, Shirley Chisholm made history once again by becoming the first African American and the first woman to run for President. But more than being a mere political first, Shirley Chisholm is best remembered for her grit, her willingness to push on the pedal of progress, and her ability to not just see America for what it is, but for what it could be.

Chisholm understood the challenges women, particularly Black women, were facing in America, and she created a path for women like me. She passed the baton, and now it is up to us to continue the race.

Ms. LEE of California. Let me thank you, Congresswoman BROWN, for that statement and for your presentation and laying out many of Shirley Chisholm's accomplishments. I mean, she was a great legislator. She passed the 1974 minimum wage law, which expanded minimum wage standards to domestic workers and a broader swath of government employees, so I am glad that you laid that out because so many of us and so many especially younger African-American women and women of color see her as this icon who ran for President, first Black woman elected, but she was an excellent legislator.

She used her contacts and leverage, and she knew how to leverage the folks, as I mentioned George Wallace's people. She understood her power. You understand your power, and I am so glad that you are here tonight for this presentation.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for some additional words.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Congresswoman, thank you so very much. I wanted to offer my appreciation first to you because I want you to be the last word on this floor tonight because I truly mean what I said earlier, and in almost every moment there has been an anecdotal story, a very important one that you have reminded us of the strength of Shirley Chisholm.

I do want to go back to Shirley's Caribbean roots, but her strong roots in Brooklyn. I know that you said this, or I am sure it has been referred to or you will, is that when she came to the United States Congress, being the first African-American woman and being dismissed not by her constituents, but by the hierarchy that was here, and I am sure someone with a little chuckle thought: Brooklyn, urban, guess where

we will put her? On the Agriculture Committee. And that will get her packing up and running out.

But Shirley Chisholm, again, fighting Shirley Chisholm was her theme, showed them. I remember those words either said by her or describe her, a tree grows in Brooklyn. Don't sell us short. A tree grows in Queens, a tree grows in Manhattan, a tree grows in New York.

She did take to the leadership of the Agriculture Committee, particularly becoming an expert on SNAP and many other aspects of agriculture that really dealt with the vulnerable and starving people in America. That was Shirley Chisholm.

And then as I intertwine the question of the selection and nomination of an African-American woman to the United States Supreme Court, I want to put in the RECORD the words, if you are always ruled but denied the opportunity to rule, in turn, you are simply a subject and not fully a citizen. And so Congresswoman Chisholm's presence was to deny being only ruled and simply being a subject.

The cases that spoke to that are the Supreme Court decisions like *Dred Scott v. Sandford*, *Plessy v. Ferguson*, *Korematsu v. United States*, civil rights cases in 1883, *Bowers v. Hardwick*, *Lochner v. New York*, and *Buck v. Bell*. These cases from 1857 to 1927 all showed where America was in terms of this cancer called racism.

I want to refer us tonight in my final words on the floor in tribute to Shirley Chisholm to the words she said about do women dare. As I do so, with a little bit of sense of great honor is to show a picture of myself and Shirley Chisholm that I now found and relocated and will actually get framed, my presenting her with an award after a speech that she gave in front of the Black women lawyers. When we were few, unknown, and unlisted and probably unappreciated, she actually came to speak before the Black women lawyers in Houston, Texas, having some years before that worked as an intern in her district at one of the State representatives' offices, Representative Bellamy.

□ 2045

And I might say, as I talk about Shirley, I have to put on the record that she was selected for the Agriculture Committee, but I am told by my former colleague, Pat Schroeder, that when she and Ron Dellums went to the Armed Services Committee, they were given one chair. And they had to sit in one chair because they were trying to diminish them and dismiss them. They could not do that. And though this is not about Ron Dellums, he became the chair of the Armed Services Committee.

But let me give these words in conclusion on the fighting Shirley Chisholm. This is her speech "Do Women Dare," and it just has been discovered. "The topic this morning of course is, 'do women dare?'"

These are her words.

"And I have said, of course women dare. Do women dare? I assume that the question implies do women dare take an active part in society, and, in particular, do they dare to take a part in the present social revolution?"

We need this now more than ever. And I would say, Do Americans dare? Do men and women dare? Do African Americans dare? Do vulnerable people dare?

"And I find the question as much of an insult as I would the question, 'Are you, as a Black person, willing to fight for your rights?' America has been sufficiently sensitized to the answer, whether or not Black people are willing to both fight and die for their rights. To make the question itself is asinine and superfluous. America is not yet sufficiently aware, but such a question applied to women is equally asinine and superfluous."

And so she goes on to say: "I am, as is obvious, both Black and a woman. And that is a good vantage point from which to view at least two elements of what is becoming a social revolution. The American Black revolution and the women's liberation movement. But it is also a horrible disadvantage. It is a disadvantage, my friends, because America as a Nation, is both racist and antifeminist. Racism and antifeminism are two of the prime traditions of this country that we have to face objectively. For any individual, therefore, challenging social traditions is a giant step. A giant step, because there are no social traditions which do not have corresponding social sanctions, the sole purpose of which are to protect the sanctity of the traditions."

And so she goes on to talk about do women dare. I cannot think of more important words in 2022 as we fight against racism and sexism, as we fight to give a sense of reality and honesty and equality to the idea of a Black woman going to the Supreme Court.

And as we raise up the issue of the study of slavery and the development of reparations proposals under H.R. 40, can that be a simple, obvious reality? Can that be something that is just accepted because it is right?

Shirley Chisholm has taught us to keep fighting and to dare. I thank the gentlewoman for bringing us to this place and also to this understanding.

Madam Speaker, this February we recognize and celebrate the 44th commemoration of Black History Month and the Jubilee anniversary of Shirley Chisholm's historic run for the presidency in 1972.

I am honored to co-anchor this Congressional Black Caucus Special Order with my dear friend and colleague, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE of California.

This month we celebrate the contributions of African Americans to the history of our great Nation, and pay tribute to trailblazers, pioneers, heroes, and leaders like KAMALA D. HARRIS, the 49th Vice-President of the United States and the first woman and person of color to be elected to the office; 44th President of the United States and First Lady,

Barack Obama and Michelle Obama, respectively; Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall; U.S. Senator Blanche Kelso Bruce; U.S. Congresswoman Barbara Jordan; U.S. Congressman Mickey Leland; Astronauts Dr. Guion Stewart Bluford, Jr. and Mae C. Jemison; activists, intellectuals, authors, artists, and entrepreneurs like Frederick Douglass, Booker T. Washington, James Baldwin, Harriet Tubman, Rosa Parks, Maya Angelou, Toni Morrison, Gwendolyn Brooks, Shonda Rhimes, Ava Duvernay, Oprah Winfrey, and Super Bowl LIV winning quarterback Patrick Mahomes and National Football League Most Valuable Player Lamar Jackson, just to name a few of the countless number of well-known and unsung heroes whose contributions have helped our Nation become a more perfect union.

The history of the United States has been marked by the great contributions of African American activists, leaders, writers, and artists.

As a member of Congress, I know that I stand on the shoulders of giants like Shirley Chisholm, John Conyers, John Lewis, Ronald Dellums, and Barbara Jordan whose struggles and triumphs made it possible for me to stand here today and continue the fight for equality, justice, and progress for all, regardless of race, religion, gender, or sexual orientation.

The greatest of these giants to me are Mrs. Ivalita "Ivy" Jackson, a vocational nurse, and Mr. Ezra C. Jackson, one of the first African Americans to succeed in the comic book publishing business.

They were my beloved parents, and they taught me the value of education, hard work, discipline, perseverance, and caring for others.

And I am continually inspired by Dr. Elwyn Lee, my husband and the first tenured African American law professor at the University of Houston.

Madam Speaker, I particularly wish to acknowledge the contributions of African American veterans in defending from foreign aggressors and who by their courageous examples helped transform our Nation from a segregated society to a nation committed to the never-ending challenge of perfecting our union.

Several years ago about this time, I was honored to join my then colleagues Congressmen John Lewis and former Congressman Charles Rangel, a Korean War veteran, in paying tribute to surviving members of the Tuskegee Airmen and the 555th Parachute Infantry, the famed "Triple Nickels" at a moving ceremony sponsored by the U.S. Army commemorating the 50th anniversary of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

The success of the Tuskegee Airmen in escorting bombers during World War II—achieving one of the lowest loss records of all the escort fighter groups and being in constant demand for their services by the allied bomber units—is a record unmatched by any other fighter group.

So impressive and astounding were the feats of the Tuskegee Airmen that in 1948, it helped persuade President Harry Truman to issue his famous Executive Order No. 9981, which directed equality of treatment and opportunity in all of the United States Armed Forces and led to the end of racial segregation in the U.S. military forces.

They proved that "the antidote to racism is excellence in performance," as retired Lt. Col. Herbert Carter once remarked.

It is a source of enormous and enduring pride that my father-in-law, Phillip Ferguson Lee, was one of the Tuskegee Airmen.

Madam Speaker, Black History Month is also a time to remember many pioneering women like activists Harriet Tubman and Rosa Parks; astronaut Mae C. Jemison; mathematicians like Katherine G. Johnson, Dorothy Vaughan, and Mary Jackson; authors Maya Angelou, Toni Morrison, and Gwendolyn Brooks; all of whom have each in their own way, whether through courageous activism, cultural or intellectual contributions, or artistic creativity, forged social and political change, and forever changed our great Nation for the better.

Madam Speaker, it is particularly fitting and proper this evening to remember and celebrate the 50th anniversary of the historic and audacious campaign for President of the late U.S. Congresswoman Shirley Anita St. Hill Chisholm.

Shirley Chisholm became the first African American woman elected to Congress, when she was elected to represent the New York's Twelfth Congressional District in 1968 running on the slogan, "Fighting Shirley Chisholm: Unbought and Unbossed."

She reflected that spirit well during her 14 years in Congress.

During her first term she spoke out for civil rights, women's rights, the poor and against the Vietnam War.

Her first term in Congress was set against the backdrop of the Civil Rights Movement and the women's movement for equal rights.

Shirley Chisholm had an understanding that during those turbulent times the Nation required a determined leader to represent the voice of so many Americans who felt dismay at their treatment.

She took an extremely active role in changing the way women were to be judged from that point on.

She remarked that "Women in this country must become revolutionaries. We must refuse to accept the old, the traditional roles and stereotypes."

This is a sentiment that I myself take to heart, women in this Nation are now told they have a right to determine the kind of life they want to lead; Shirley Chisholm was at the core of this movement.

On January 25, 1972, Chisholm announced her candidacy for President.

She stood before the cameras and in the beginning of her speech she said:

"I stand before you today as a candidate for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency of the United States.

"I am not the candidate of black America, although I am black and proud.

"I am not the candidate of the women's movement of this country, although I am a woman, and I am equally proud of that. I am not the candidate of any political bosses or special interests.

"I am the candidate of the people."

Shirley Chisholm did not win the nomination; but she went on to the Democratic Convention in Miami and received 151 delegates' votes.

More than that, she demonstrated the will and determination of so many Americans, particularly black women, who had previously felt forgotten, and she lit the fire inspiring so many who had felt disenfranchised.

I am glad to walk in their footsteps and will continue to encourage women to uphold the

principles they taught us to fight for and cherish.

Madam Speaker, because Shirley Chisholm dared to reach for the brass ring 50 years ago, she ushered in the era where women could aspire, seek, and win leadership roles in this country's local, State, and national governments.

Before Shirley Chisholm, no black woman had ever served in the U.S. House of Representatives or the U.S. Senate, but following in her footsteps are 51 black women Members of Congress, two black women U.S. Senators, including the President of that body and Vice-President of the United States; 23 Hispanic members; and 15 Asian-Pacific Members, along with the first woman Speaker of the House, and mayors of several of the largest cities in the Nation, including the District of Columbia, Chicago, San Francisco, Atlanta, New Orleans, Baltimore, Hartford, Minneapolis, San Antonio, and St. Louis.

One barrier left to fall, however, is one of the most important, and that is membership on the Supreme Court of the United States.

For most of our national history, Presidents and Senators have turned a deaf ear to Abigail Adams' plea to her husband "to remember the ladies and be more generous and favourable to them than your ancestors."

Since Justice O'Connor's 1981 appointment, only four women have been nominated to the High Court for the 18 vacancies occurring during this time despite the fact that women constitute a majority of the general population, 37 percent of all attorneys in America, a number that will soon exceed the majority since a substantial majority (54 percent) of all law students in America are women.

With the announcement of his retirement by Associate Justice Stephen Breyer, President Biden and the U.S. Senate, now have been presented and should move quickly to capitalize on this opportunity to begin to rectify the High Court's gender imbalance and to diversify its composition by nominating and confirming a member of the most underrepresented, disadvantaged, marginalized, longest suffering, and most patient demographic in America: black woman.

Longer than any other racial or ethnic group, black women have been subjected to the coercive powers of the law while being excluded from the opportunities to make the laws citizens are to live under.

If you are always ruled but denied the opportunity to rule in turn, you are simply a subject, and not fully a citizen. And that is how you get Supreme Court decisions like *Dred Scott v. Sanford* (1857), *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896), *Korematsu v. United States* (1944), *Civil Rights Cases* (1883), *Bowers v. Hardwick* (1986), *Lochner v. New York* (1905), and *Buck v. Bell* (1927).

Simply stated, the purpose of pursuing diversity in the composition of a political system's decision-making institutions is not to elevate any particular man or woman, but to enhance, as Condorcet's Theorem posits, the quality and accuracy of institutional decision making and to bolster institutional legitimacy by increasing its diffuse support from marginal members of the political community.

Researchers have shown that people are more likely to trust those with whom they share physical characteristics and thus as documented by the Center for American Progress, "in the interests of both equality and

the perception of fairness, it is important that judges reflect the parties and populations they serve."

Or as described by scholars Jason Iuliano and Avery Stewart, "In dispensing justice to all citizens, the legal system cannot allow one demographically homogenous group to hand down decisions while other racial and ethnic groups bear the brunt of those decisions."

The federal judiciary, particularly the Supreme Court, does not resemble the public at large. Glaring disparities exist for women, African Americans, Hispanics, Asian Americans, American Indians, and LGBTQ individuals.

Consider for example that of all the judges currently sitting on federal Article III courts, only about 10 percent are African American and 2.6 percent are Asian American.

In contrast, Blacks and African Americans comprise 12.5 percent of the U.S. population, while Asians make up 5.7 percent of the population.

Hispanics are woefully underrepresented on the courts compared with their share of the population with only 6.6 percent of sitting federal judges of Hispanic origin despite the fact that this group comprises 18.3 percent of the U.S. population.

It is neither improper nor erroneous to say that President Biden owes black women because without their overwhelming support, his reeling campaign would not have cruised to victory in the 2020 South Carolina presidential primary, which led to his resounding wins on Super Tuesday, which put him on the glide path to the Democratic nomination and victory in the general election.

So, if anybody is ever due to fulfill a key campaign promise, it is President Biden vowing to make "sure there's a Black woman on the Supreme Court, to make sure we in fact get every representation."

And when President Biden acts to keep his sacred promise, Shirley Chisholm will be smiling down at us from Heaven.

It is also fitting, Madam Speaker, that in addition to those national leaders whose contributions have made our Nation better, we also honor those who have and are making a difference in their local communities.

In my home city of Houston, there are numerous men and women who are great because they have heeded the counsel of Dr. King who said:

"Everybody can be great because anybody can serve. You only need a heart full of grace. A soul generated by love."

By that measure, I wish to pay tribute to some of the great men and women who help to make Houston the wonderful, dynamic, vibrant, inclusive, and progressive city that it is.

As we celebrate Black History Month, let us pay tribute to those who have come before us, and pay forward to future generations by addressing what is the number one issue for African American families, and all American families today: preserving the American promise of economic opportunity for all.

Our immediate focus must be to work 'For The People' to crush the pandemic, continue this Administration's and this Congress's record setting pace for job creation (6.5 million in the first year), and enacting legislation that will foster and lay the foundation for today's and tomorrow's generation of groundbreaking activists, leaders, scientists, writers and artists to continue contributing to the greatness of America.

We must continue to preserve the American Dream for all.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to stand here in celebration of the heroic and historic acts of African Americans and their indispensable contributions to this great Nation.

It is through our work in creating possibilities for today and future generations that we best honor the accomplishments and legacy of our predecessors.

[From Rolling Stone, February 3, 2022]

SHIRLEY CHISHOLM'S NEWLY UNEARTHED 'DO WOMEN DARE?' SPEECH IS JUST AS RELEVANT TODAY

In July 1971, Shirley Chisholm began to talk about it. Chisholm, who in 1968 had become the first African American woman elected to Congress, would run for president. The congresswoman from New York announced her intentions to secure the Democratic nomination in September, and formally announced on Jan. 25, 1972. The Democratic candidates who sought to oppose President Nixon's bid for a second term counted "Fighting Shirley" and nine white men, all of whom had higher degrees, like Chisholm. Of the 10, all but Chisholm, Wilbur Mills, and Hubert Humphrey had served in the military. Chisholm was the first African American to contend for the presidential nomination of a major party.

On the 50th anniversary of Chisholm's protest-era run, America is again reassessing itself and its history; the lesson of historical re-evaluation is seemingly how well we forget, and how fallible we are in remembering. Chisholm taught at the New School from 1971-75. "Black Power and White Politics," her inaugural course (eight sessions for \$40) posed the question: "Can the political system be made responsive to the needs of minorities?"

The issues are familiar, as is the broil of her audience and a citizenship that feels unheard. Chisholm, in 1972, is already a celebrity—simultaneously a voice of the people and a spokesperson for a lying, thieving political system manipulated by Ivy League elites. The Chisholm audience, as well as the camera crew, chuckles uncomfortably as one questioner takes the soapbox, picking up "the hot coal" and imploring listeners to consider: "Why do we fail as a country to address these urgent needs . . . what is basically wrong with America that we can keep talking and everything gets worse?"

"The American public as a whole is too complacent," Chisholm answers. "Not only is it complacent but it's also gullible. . . . We don't question enough. We don't concern ourselves about things until they hit us on our front doorstep. . . . For a long time we had been taught in America about the need to bring about 'social justice' that nobody worried about before in this society. But all of a sudden, middle-class America woke up about six years ago, when we began to have riots and conflagrations in the big cities of this country. Prior to that, nobody wondered what was happening to the Indian, the African American, or even the Puerto Rican, or even the Black because we were getting along as a whole and it didn't touch us on our front doorstep."

Tracking back to 1969, we find Chisholm empaneled at the New School with Gloria Steinem, author, feminist, and activist, and Jacqueline Grenenwexler, the former president of Webster College. The three women, inaugurating the Human Relations Center at the New School, considered the provocation "Do Women Dare?"

In the wake of the social upheavals of recent years, the speech, which is not known to have been published or broadcast since the

event 50 years ago, feels as vital today as it did half a century ago. Through the discussion, Chisholm pointed to what we would now call intersectionality; the term was coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw in 1989 to describe the ways in which identity is nuanced and individual experience is not based on skin color or class alone. Intersectionality makes the invisible visible. It adds dimensionality to a type of racism that can be one-dimensional. What is diversity without diverse socioeconomic backgrounds?

Recorded via a WBAI broadcast, and newly digitized and transcribed here, Chisholm's opening remarks for the 1969 panel are expansive, yet immediate. She's radical in one moment, citing the divisive author Eldridge Cleaver, and pronouncedly centrist in the next, pointing back to personal responsibility: "The law cannot do it for us. We must do it for ourselves." Chisholm's words are charged and nuanced and controversial, she is hearing the unheard, endeavoring to listen and to keep listening and vowing to fight. Here are her remarks.

Shirley Chisholm:

The topic this morning of course is, "do women dare?" And I have said, of course women dare. Do women dare? I assume that the question implies do women dare take an active part in society and, in particular, do they dare to take a part in the present social revolution? And I find the question as much of an insult as I would the question, "Are you, as a Black person, willing to fight for your rights?" America has been sufficiently sensitized to the answer, whether or not Black people are willing to both fight and die for their rights. To make the question itself is asinine and superfluous. America is not yet sufficiently aware, but such a question applied to women is equally asinine and superfluous.

I am, as is obvious, both Black and a woman. And that is a good vantage point from which to view at least two elements of what is becoming a social revolution. The American Black revolution and the women's liberation movement. But it is also a horrible disadvantage. It is a disadvantage, my friends, because America as a nation, is both racist and antifeminist. Racism and antifeminism are two of the prime traditions of this country that we have to face objectively. For any individual, therefore, challenging social traditions is a giant step. A giant step, because there are no social traditions which do not have corresponding social sanctions, the sole purpose of which are to protect the sanctity of the traditions.

Then when we ask the question, "do women dare?" we are not asking are women capable of a break with tradition so much as we are asking, are they capable of bearing with the sanctions that will be placed upon them? Coupling this with the hypothesis presented by some social thinkers and philosophers that in any given society the most active group are those who are nearest to the particular freedom that they desire, it does not surprise me that those women, most active and vocal on the issue of freedom for women, are those who are young, white, and middle class. Nor is it also too surprising that there are not more from that group involved in the women's liberation movement. There certainly are reasons why more women are not involved, and this country, as I said, is antifeminist. Few, if any Americans, are free of the psychological wounds imposed by racism and antifeminism.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman JACKSON LEE for reminding us of Shirley Chisholm's history here in the Capitol as a member of the Agriculture Committee.



Now, you know I worked for the late Ron Dellums starting in 1975, and I worked for him for 11 years. I got a chance to be with Congresswoman Chisholm many times, also with Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, so I got a chance to know her and her brilliance and her stately demeanor and her huge intellect.

And I remember very clearly that Congresswoman Chisholm also was on the Rules Committee. And I know she was only the second woman to ever be appointed to the Rules Committee. Again, I have to go back to 1789 because I want the public to understand the centuries that took place during the interim.

First, Congresswoman Chisholm was the second woman on the Rules Committee since 1789, and I believe—and we are checking—I think that she may have been the first member of the CBC on the Rules Committee also. But also, in terms of Congresswoman Chisholm's history and bringing it current, she was an original board member, first honorary copresident in 1969 of the National Abortion Rights Action League, better known as NARAL, and she was a fierce advocate for women's reproductive rights and justice. And she was also only one of 16 Black women who courageously led a movement for reproductive freedom that began with the publishing of the very seminal brochure "We Remember: African American Women Are For Reproductive Freedom." And that was in 1989.

And so Congresswoman Chisholm has been honored in so many different ways throughout the years, but we need to do more. We are going to start with our Chisholm Trail. For those who want to join us this year we are going to commemorate the Chisholm Trail.

I was so pleased that Chairwoman BEATTY mentioned the Shirley Chisholm stamp. It took us a long time to do this, but it was a bipartisan effort. We finally have a Forever Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm's historical stamp from the Postal Service.

Also, she posthumously was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom from President Barack Obama. For her official portrait, I thank Speaker NANCY PELOSI because that was one of her first efforts working with us. And you remember Congresswoman Juanita Millender-McDonald, another African-American woman, brilliant woman, from Southern California who passed away. She was chairing the House Administration Committee, and we got together. And this wasn't easy. And I thank Speaker PELOSI for helping us because it was a heavy lift to get this beautiful portrait painted by a young brother down in Southern California into this temple of democracy.

And at first, there were those who wanted the portrait to be hidden in some little corner. Well, Speaker PELOSI and Lorraine Miller, Clerk of the House, made sure that she was placed in a prominent place so that people, especially young people, could

get a chance to know her and to love her because what she did for this country was so amazing for everyone, for the voiceless, and she was a person, a woman, a Black woman who loved to bring people together from all backgrounds.

So there are so many other materials across the country to remember her fortitude and to honor her grit and tenacity. And she taught me once again, and I know Congresswoman JACKSON LEE knows this, that Black women can't go along to get along. Again, 1789.

These rules weren't made for us. So we must change these rules of the game, so that we must address gender and racial equity at its core.

Before Congresswoman Chisholm passed away, she was asked how she wanted to be remembered. And I remember she said: I want history to remember me not just as the first Black woman to be elected to Congress, not as the first Black woman to have made a bid for the Presidency of the United States, but as a Black woman who lived in the 20th century and dared to be herself. I want to be remembered as a catalyst for change in America.

And so I can confidently say that that is her legacy. Well done, Mrs. C, well done. Her staff and many of us called her "Mrs. C." She had a phenomenal staff, Carolyn Smith. She had an African-American woman as her chief of staff. She was one of the few, like Ron Dellums, who had senior staff members who were Black, Black women, three of us on the Hill at that point. So she lived a life that we can all be proud of and how she paved the way for so many of us to be here as Members of Congress, but also throughout the country as members of elected bodies and corporate boardrooms. Congresswoman Chisholm made sure that she left her legacy so that, yes, as someone said earlier, we finally have the first African-American Vice President in the country. Because of Shirley Chisholm, I am. Because of Shirley Chisholm, Kamala Harris is.

Madam Speaker, I thank my staff Rico Doss and Kayla Williams on my staff for really pulling this all together and helping us with all of this. And, Sheila, your staff and the Congressional Black Caucus members' staff because without our staff—as I know because I was a staffer for many years—none of this would have happened tonight. So I thank you guys very much.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I often say that I am operating in an institution and system that was not designed by or for people who look like me. Today, however, I celebrate a pioneer who wanted to change the system so that it would work for all the people—Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm.

I stand proudly on the shoulders of the first Black woman in Congress. She entered Congress "unbossed and unbought" and brought this energy to each of her seven terms. She paved the way for me to be here as the first

Black woman to represent the people of Georgia's Fifth District in Congress.

We are the next generation of Black excellence because of Shirley Chisholm. As we face trying times, we must remember that we stand on the brink of progress. The courage of Shirley Chisholm paved the way for Black women in Congress to fight for a future that our children can believe in:

Voting rights regardless of our ZIP code.

Lasting investments in our HBCUs.

The Black Maternal Health Momnibus to end the Black maternal mortality crisis.

The George Floyd Justice in Policing Act to end police brutality.

My Abolition Amendment legislation that will close a loophole in the Thirteenth Amendment and truly end slavery in America.

As we reflect on how far we have come this Black History Month, I am looking forward to the future we are building together because of the path set by Congresswoman Chisholm.

However, we have a long way to go. The halls of Congress are full of portraits and statues of mostly men, while depictions of women are scattered here and there. Images of trailblazers like Shirley Chisholm and Rosa Parks remind me of the imbalance of women lining the halls, and I am determined to change that.

May we always remember Congresswoman Chisholm for her tenacity, her boldness, and her guts. That is what we will need to ensure that our story continues.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Madam Speaker, today I rise in honor of the first African American woman to serve in the United States Congress and the first woman to run for President of the United States, the Honorable Shirley Chisholm. As we celebrate Black history month, we must also commemorate our heroes for their contribution to protecting and preserving our precious democracy.

I, including many of my colleagues here in Congress, stand on the shoulders of this courageous woman who was a champion for progressive policy that sought to improve the lives of society's most vulnerable both internationally and domestically. In particular, she fought against the oppressive Apartheid Regime in South Africa and the Vietnam War. In addition, she was instrumental in the movement for women's rights and the poor.

The Honorable Shirley Chisholm understood the plight of the poor and working-class in this country. The reality is that there is no American Dream without economic equity. I am committed to continuing her activism in addressing the wealth gap. The average Black household has \$24k in wealth, whereas the average White family has \$188K in wealth. Approximately 30 percent of my District's residents live on under \$75K a year, while 21% live under \$30K.

To address these systemic challenges, it is vital to ensure that Congress resembles the diversity that exists in this nation. However, in states like mine, the Governor of Florida, Ron DeSantis, is committed to disfranchising voters through gerrymandering in violation of the Voting Rights Act and the Constitution. Ron DeSantis took the unprecedented and anti-democratic step of proposing his own Congressional map for the state of Florida. Under DeSantis' proposed plan, two Congressional seats currently held by African-American representatives elected overwhelmingly by working Floridians would lose their seats.

This is yet another attack on Floridians' sacred right to vote and a blatantly undemocratic

power grab. We believe that voters should choose their representatives, not the other way around. By injecting partisanship into the redistricting process, DeSantis is attempting to dilute minority representation and undermine the true will of Florida voters. He is a threat to our democracy. My colleagues and I will continue to fight against his racist and discriminatory proposal.

The Honorable Shirley Chisholm once said, "I want to be remembered as a woman . . . who dared to be a catalyst of change." I hope that her legacy and commitment to service will inspire us all to continue defending the United States Constitution and fight tirelessly to improve the lives of our constituents through progressive policy.

#### BACK THE BLUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I rise today to show an army of congressional leaders who back the blue. I rise to show our colleagues on the other side of the aisle and Americans across the country that we won't back down when it comes to supporting our men and women in uniform.

Since my time in Congress began just over 1 year ago, I have made it my mission to show not just in words but also in action that our LEOs across the country have a thin blue line army that won't back down, that won't quit, and that will always have their six.

Today, we rise to honor the heroes in our midst, the everyday public servants who get up daily to don the badge, run into harm's way, moving towards danger and working hard to keep us all safe.

Amid efforts to defund our police, leading to a rise in crime with no response from elected officials nationwide or from this administration; amid phony bail reform efforts that do nothing to keep dangerous criminals behind bars; amid an opioid crisis with record levels of drugs pouring into our communities, perpetuated by the crisis at our southern border—because we all know that you cannot defend your hometowns if you cannot protect the homeland—amid dangerous rhetoric spread by the ill-informed; amid increasing levels of vitriol for this profession, these real heroes, well, they show up.

□ 2100

Madam Speaker, I stood on this floor in March of last year as my Democrat

colleagues passed a bill to defund police. They defunded police. Now, that night, I challenged my colleagues across the aisle to a ride-along. Not a single one—not one—took me up on my offer.

Instead, my team and I set out to do the ride-alongs that my colleagues would not. And wow, did we learn a lot. Whether it was domestic violence, robbery, battery, violent brawls, drunk drivers, drug busts—everything in between—these ride-alongs proved it. These men and women who wear the badge, they are amazing. They are imperfect beings doing the toughest of jobs with the best of intentions. They are criticized, demonized, and vilified, and yet, they continue to answer the call in the face of it all.

Madam Speaker, 2021 was the deadliest year on record for members of the law enforcement community—the deadliest. Next to me, you see the names of all those that we lost. You probably can't see the names very well or even care to read them. There is 458 of them—the poster isn't even big enough to accommodate all of the names. That is 458 families shattered forever. That is 458 departments forever changed. That is 458 lives lost.

As the wife of a first responder, I know all too well that feeling of twists and turns and pain that comes when a SWAT callout has come out. I know what it is like to sit at the kitchen table and wait for the call, the text letting me know that the callout is over and that my husband is on his way back to the department or to the station.

I know what it is like, and that is perhaps why I stand here today more resolved than ever to stand in defense and in support of those who protect and serve every day. To the spouses of our men and women in law enforcement, know that you have a friend and sister in this fight. Know that your service alongside your partner is just as valuable and important to all those across the country. Whether you call yourself a deputy or an officer, an LEO spouse or family member, the message is simple: My colleagues and I, we see you, we hear you, we support you, and we will always have your six.

To those who seek to divide, defund, and disparage, know that every attempt that you make to hurt our LEOs and defund our departments, it will only be in vain. Your efforts to make our communities less safe will fail. Your efforts to hurt our families will falter. My colleagues and I, we will make sure of it.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the brave men and women who are serving in law enforcement, who protect our communities, and keep our streets safe.

As a former law enforcement for 23 years, I know the sacrifices made by them and their families. Every day,

law enforcement officers walk out of their homes leaving their loved ones behind, and put their own lives on the line for the safety and security of others. They don't get to choose which call for service they go on. The dangers they face every day while keeping us safe are all too real.

Instead of showing gratitude for their service, dedication, and sacrifice, far too many people are using defund and disrespect the police rhetoric that is leading to violence against the men and women in blue and brown. In fact, more police officers have been killed in the line of duty under President Biden's leadership than in previous years. It is no secret that morale in the law enforcement community is low, and many dedicated officers are leaving the force.

Police departments across the country are struggling to fill vacancies and crime rates, which have risen. This is a direct result of the demonization and vilification of the profession by some political leaders to score political points. The men and women serving in local law enforcement deserve our respect and support. They are the last line of defense and the protectors of our communities. I am so honored to have served alongside some of these brave men and women.

We must be vocal in expressing our support for our local law enforcement during these times. We must make the same commitment to them as they have committed to our friends, our families, and our communities. It is the least that we can do for them and their families. I am happy to stand here today, along with so many of my colleagues, to show support.

Unlike my Democrat colleagues, Republicans don't need election year polling to stand with law enforcement who keep our communities safe. Minnesotans and all Americans deserve to live in safe communities, and I will continue to work to ensure this is our shared reality. We all owe them our thanks.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman and my friend and colleague from the great State of Minnesota.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN), my friend and colleague.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida, Mrs. CAMMACK, for having this and honoring law enforcement in this Special Order.

Madam Speaker, the surge and violence across the country and the targeted attacks on our brave law enforcement officers are happening thanks to the Democrats' relentless calls to defund the police.

The left has brazenly stripped the police departments of necessary funding and enacted new laws that actually ensure that violent criminals have the freedom to inflict more harm. To be clear, violent criminals are being released on little to no bail only to kill again.

This is the Democrats' America. These shameful and purely political policies put criminals above law-abiding citizens. Our law enforcement officials should be respected and honored for their role in keeping us safe.

Tonight, I want to highlight one such individual, Tyler County native, growing up in Spurger, Texas, Texas Ranger, Joe Haralson, from my county, Tyler County, Texas.

Joe was an Army infantryman during the Vietnam war and earned the Bronze Star and Air Medal, with Oak Leaf Clusters for both, for his heroic service. Less than a year after returning home in Vietnam from 1971, Joe enrolled himself in the Department of Public Safety's 18-week training academy in Austin, Texas. After a decade of hard work as a DPS officer, Joe finally received his Texas Ranger badge.

This year marks Joe's 41st year with the Texas Rangers. He is the longest serving Texas Ranger in Texas' illustrious history, and what a hero he is. He has served his fellow Texans for more than half a century, and his time in law enforcement is nothing short of amazing and inspiring.

Over the decades, Joe has worked on cases involving murders, robberies, kidnappings, rapes, and much more. He has seen the face of evil countless times, yet is one of the humblest and kindest men that you will ever meet.

It is a privilege to have this American patriot as a friend, share his story, express my sincerest gratitude for his devotion to our community and to our State of Texas. These are the heroes that radical Democrats have abandoned, but I never will.

God bless you, Joe.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from the great State of Texas. I am proud to call him friend. Thank you for honoring this incredible patriot.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIMENEZ), my friend and colleague from the Sunshine State.

Mr. GIMENEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, the woke left have stood idly by as rabid criminals have embarked on an all-out assault on our police officers. Rather than standing up for the brave men and women of law enforcement—the very ones who put their lives on the line every day to keep our families and communities safe—they have bent over backwards to the most radical fringes of the progressive movement that actively works to defund, disarm, and disband our police departments.

The result? Under Joe Biden's first year as President, police officers have seen a historic spike in violent crime against them.

In 2021 alone, there were 346 officers shot in the line of duty resulting in 63 deaths.

Police officers were victims to 103 ambush-style attacks, which increased 115 percent over the prior year.

The FBI reported a 48.7 increase in 2021 of officers' killings, both on-duty and off-duty, totaling 73 deaths from firearms, vehicles, knives, and other personal weapons. Believe it or not, those numbers represent the highest number of law enforcement officers who were intentionally killed since the terror attacks of September 11.

Last week, House Homeland Security Committee Republicans stood up to demand the Department of Justice open a Federal investigation into these egregious spikes in crime against our police officers.

□ 2110

President Biden, his administration, and the Democrats who maintain a stranglehold on Congress must find the courage to break with the radical liberals who want to defund, disarm, and disband our police and show up with unprecedented support for our officers in blue.

I, for one, am proud to back the blue. Thank you to our officers for all the work and your sacrifices. Know that the Republicans in this Chamber stand with you and have your back.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from the Sunshine State.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO), my friend and colleague.

Mr. KATKO. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague on the Homeland Security Committee for holding this important Special Order to let law enforcement officers all over the United States know this simple truth: We support you, and we have your back.

For over 20 years, I served as an organized crime prosecutor on the Federal level, focusing on narcotics, gang, and corruption prosecutions, among many others, in central New York, along the southwest border, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, all over the United States, and all over the world.

I worked alongside incredible men and women in law enforcement every day. They are some of the most courageous and selfless people I know, and they put their lives on the line to protect our communities.

The officers I have worked with were assaulted. They were shot. Some were killed. Yet, time and time again, the officers showed up every day to do their jobs and dispatch their duties with honor and dignity, despite not being paid anywhere near what they should.

Unfortunately, our brothers and sisters in law enforcement are hurting right now. Violence against law enforcement officers has become a troubling pattern across the United States, culminating most recently in violent shooting deaths of officers in New York City and Houston. Sadly, this violence is part of an upward national trend.

According to the National Fraternal Order of Police, in 2021, there were 346 officers shot in the line of duty, and 103

were ambush-style attacks, which increased 115 percent over the prior year. Tragically, 73 officers were killed. According to the data from the FBI, this accounts for a 50 percent increase.

These grim statistics represent the highest number of law enforcement who were intentionally killed since the terror attacks of September 11, 2001.

As ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee and chair of the American Security Task Force, I have heard directly from law enforcement officers about the challenges police departments face as crimes continue to rise. I have traveled across the country where the effects of the defund the police and go against the police movements are at their worst.

In New York City, for example, the department was cut by close to \$1 billion in 2020. In 2021, it broke the State record for annual homicides. They cut cops. They cut shifts. They passed laws in New York State that made it very difficult for officers to do their jobs and made it very easy for violent criminals to get back on the streets.

In Portland, Oregon, a center for the defund the police movement, homicides are up 530 percent. That was because they cut their police department by 10 percent and eliminated the violent crime unit. Of course, that is going to happen. The increase in crime, coupled with recruitment and retention problems, will only compound the crime problems this country is currently facing.

Instead of vilifying police, let's figure out how to make police departments better by investing in them. How can you possibly retrain police when you defund them? How can you implement new policies and get officers ready for those new policies when you cut their funding? It doesn't work.

Today, we are facing troubling new challenges. Our law enforcement officers are being asked to do more with less, and it is putting their lives at risk. In addition to their crime-fighting responsibilities, our officers are on the front lines, facing the threat of terrorism and an unprecedented opioid epidemic.

Homeland security is being degraded because defunded police and vilified police departments do not have sufficient resources for counterterrorism operations.

It takes courage to wear a badge. It takes even more courage to respond to an emergency, to engage a suspect, to walk down a dark alley, or to confront a terrorist. For law enforcement, that is part of their job every single day.

My committee and the task force are proud to stand with law enforcement as they continue to do this honorable work. I will always have their backs, and they will always have my thanks and admiration.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD), my friend and colleague.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the men and women in law enforcement who risk their lives every day to keep us safe. In return, Congress owes it to them to do everything in our power to keep them safe.

As many of you know, I spent over 40 years in law enforcement, including 12 years as sheriff of Duval County, Florida. Sadly, some of my friends and colleagues paid the ultimate price in the line of duty. In fact, our memorial wall is filled with the names of too many good police officers who laid down their lives in service to their community.

When you are called to policing, you know the undertaking that you are taking is a dangerous job. This growing antipolice rhetoric and widespread efforts to defund police departments are leaving officers increasingly at risk to attacks, and communities are less safe.

In 2022, 89 officers around the country lost their lives to gunfire, beatings, stabbing, or vehicular assault, officers like Nassau County Deputy Joshua Moyers, who was killed last year in an attack while conducting a traffic stop in northeast Florida.

So, what are we doing in Congress to help stop these attacks? I have introduced a bipartisan bill called the Protect and Serve Act, which would increase penalties for individuals who deliberately target law enforcement officers with violence. In 2018, the Protect and Serve Act overwhelmingly passed the House 382-35.

I urge my Democrat colleagues to come back to the table and support this important legislation. Police officers' lives depend on it.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, Sheriff RUTHERFORD.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a champion for our law enforcement.

Mr. BURGESS. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida for the recognition. She does a great job for the Congress, and we are all so grateful to have her here.

Madam Speaker, this is such an important topic tonight. Ranking Member KATKO delineated the number of law enforcement jurisdictions who have seen funding cut and the unfortunate consequences that occurred on the populations that they serve. Did you ever stop to think of what would happen if there were just an absolute defunding of the police department?

Well, unfortunately, we only need to look about a hundred years past to see such an example. It happened in Boston, Massachusetts, in September 1919. The police force was unfunded, and the city was unprotected. This was documented in a book by a gentleman named Francis Russell. The book is called "A City in Terror."

What was startling to me when I read the book was not that there was a gradual descent into lawlessness, but it

happened like turning a switch. Police were not on the job. The city sunk into chaos—robberies, beatings, assaults, looting. And it went on for several days until the Governor of that State called up the National Guard and reasserted authority.

Who was that Governor? It is kind of a rarity to stop and think about it now, but it was a Republican Governor of Massachusetts named Calvin Coolidge. It was that activity of restoring order in the city that catapulted him to fame and caused him to receive the Vice Presidential nomination in the Republican Convention of 1920. And as they say, the rest is history.

Please, let us not forget our history. Defunding the police does not lead us to a better place. It does not lead us to a more just and civil society. It invites chaos.

□ 2120

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I thank Dr. BURGESS for his steadfast support for law enforcement.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE), who is my friend and a supporter of law enforcement.

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me and for hosting this Special Order. I would be here to speak in support of the men and women in law enforcement regardless.

Tonight, I come to the House floor to honor two local heroes: Officers John Painter and J.J. Jefferson, who were killed in the line of duty last week while responding to reports of a suspicious individual at nearby Bridgewater College. Their funerals this week will be overflowing with members of the community, the campus, law enforcement, and members of government and civil officials, all of whom loved these two heroes.

Officer John Painter dedicated his life to public service. Prior to becoming a campus police officer at Bridgewater, Painter served in the United States Air Force and the Army National Guard. He spent time as a deputy sheriff in King George County, and he was a member of the Grottoes Police Department for 18 years before retiring as chief in 2018.

Painter was known as a loving family man with a great loyalty to his friends and community. Those who knew him say that his devotion to others could not go unnoticed.

Like Officer Painter, Officer J.J. Jefferson committed his life to protecting and serving others before coming to Bridgewater College in 2018. Jefferson began his law enforcement career in 1997 as a patrol officer with the Fairfax County Sheriff's Office prior to spending 12 years as national reconnaissance officer in Chantilly, Virginia. Jefferson then served as a sergeant with the Shenandoah University Department of Public Safety during which time he was awarded the James B. Wilkins Award for his proactive security initia-

tives. A veteran of the United States Marine Corps, Jefferson is remembered for his boisterous laugh and endearing smile.

Known as the dynamic duo, the two officers were the closest of friends with Officer Painter even serving as the best man at Jefferson's wedding.

Students describe the officers as family and said the pair "really cared about all of us—all of us."

Painter and Jefferson made it a point to connect with those they were tasked with protecting, embedding themselves into the community by eating lunch with students, hanging out with them at campus gathering spots, and offering words of wisdom to those they interacted with.

Officers Jefferson and Painter gave their lives to protect students on campus, and our community is forever grateful for their sacrifice. Their efforts surely prevented even greater loss of life, and the dynamic duo's actions will never be forgotten.

The Bridgewater community mourns their tragic passing, and our prayers remain with their families in this difficult time.

Tonight, we remember the words in John 15:13: No one has greater love than this, to lay down one's life for one's friends.

Rest in peace, Officers Painter and Jefferson.

God bless.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I yield to my friend and colleague from the Sunshine State of Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), who is a champion for law enforcement.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the brave men and women who serve in law enforcement throughout our great Nation.

New statistics indicate that intentional killings of law enforcement officers in 2021 reached a 20-year high—this is tragic—excluding 9/11.

Tragically, two of those officers killed in the line of duty during 2021 have been my constituents: Deputy Michael Magli of the Pinellas County Sheriff's Office and Master Patrol Officer Jesse Madsen of Tampa Police Department. I went to the funeral services of those two heroes and shared the anguish of their grieving families and colleagues.

Additionally, in 2014, Officer Charlie K. Kondek from my hometown of Tarpon Springs, Florida, who was part of the Tarpon Springs Police Department, was killed in the line of duty.

These fallen heroes leave behind a distinguished legacy of service and sacrifice that deserves to be honored.

I am proud to cosponsor, along with my great friend, KAT CAMMACK, from Gainesville, Florida—so we are Floridians and Florida Gators—the Back the Blue Act and the Protect and Serve Act of 2021. Both of those bills will increase the Federal penalties for crimes targeting members of the law enforcement community and strengthen funding for programs to improve relations

between law enforcement and the communities they serve.

Law enforcement agencies around the country have faced undeserved political attacks by the defund the police movement. This is unacceptable as far as I am concerned. This is a dangerous and destructive proposition and has only increased violence.

We should, in fact, be increasing support and funding for our law enforcement. I respect the service and sacrifice of our first responders and their families, and I will continue to do everything I can to support them.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for having this Special Order which is so very important. I appreciate it.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from the freedom State, Florida, for his remarks.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST), who is the ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and a fellow patriot and ardent supporter of law enforcement.

Mr. BOST. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my friend, Congresswoman KAT CAMMACK from Florida, for her organization of this Special Order tonight.

Madam Speaker, I know that these Special Orders go long, and I know quite often the person who is sitting in the Speaker's chair quite often focuses on whatever is going on on their cell phones, but I really hope that you are paying attention tonight because my district is right across from yours.

Last year, two families in my district received the call that every law enforcement family just dreads—a call informing them that their loved ones will not be returning home.

On August 4, Brooklyn, Illinois, Police Officer Brian Pierce Jr. was deploying spike strips on a bridge during a car chase. He was hit and fatally injured by the fleeing vehicle. Brian was only 24 years old.

On October 26, we lost Pontoon Beach, Illinois, Police Officer Tyler Timmins. He was tragically killed while investigating a stolen vehicle at a gas station. Tyler was only 36 years old, Madam Speaker, and a 14-year veteran of the force. He left behind his wife, Linsey, whom he had just married 1 month before as well as his daughter, Chloe.

Sadly, their families are not alone in their pain. In 2021, 73 officers were killed in the line of duty—the highest number in 26 years. The liberals at the Federal law level, at the State level, and at the local level push to defund police, Madam Speaker. I want you to understand that that agenda has made our communities less safe.

Even in the State of Illinois on a lame-duck session in the middle of the night they passed the bill that made it to where we defunded police and endangered our police officers. Their rhetoric has emboldened criminals, putting our brave officers' lives in danger.

Despite it all, our police officers continue to show up and run towards the danger to protect our communities every day, even if they are being shot at.

Madam Speaker, do you know why this is so personal to me?

My son-in-law is a deputy sheriff in Jackson County, Illinois.

This issue is personal to me and my family.

Why?

Because I see the crap he sees every day. But I know that he is doing it because he cares about those who need help.

I will always stand for our men and women of law enforcement and will do all that I can to ensure they get the support that they deserve. I only wish that all of my colleagues would join in with me to do that and stop spreading the rhetoric of defunding police.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from the great State of Illinois for his impassioned and accurate remarks.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER), who is my good friend.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Madam Speaker, I thank Kat for holding this very Special Order tonight.

I rise today to honor our police officers and to condemn those who shamefully unleash defund the police rhetoric into our communities. Next to me are the images of nearly 90 police officers who were killed in the line of duty just last year.

□ 2130

There are so many lives lost that I had to make three separate posters. These courageous men and women lost their lives by being shot, assaulted, stabbed, or hit by cars.

Sadly, America has seen a 115 percent increase in ambush attacks on our police officers. There is no doubt in my mind that liberal hatred and vitriol against law enforcement played a role in the uptick of the attacks on our officers. It is clear: Rhetoric has consequences.

The faces on these pages are fathers and mothers, loved ones. One of them was a fellow Missourian. Last year, Police Officer Blaize Madrid-Evans of Independence, Missouri, lost his life while responding to a call when a criminal opened fire and killed him. Blaize was only 22 years old, and he was engaged to be married. He had his whole life ahead of him. This is tragic. This is unacceptable. Things must change.

Our law enforcement officers deserve our respect, support, and thanks. Nothing else.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), my friend and colleague, a champion for our law enforcement officers.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Madam Speaker, I thank Mrs. CAMMACK very much for

yielding. I am proud to join my colleagues and rise today in honor of the brave men and women in blue who serve and protect us each and every day.

According to new statistics released by the FBI, intentional killings of law enforcement in 2021 were the highest in 20 years. Every day police officers across central Washington, as well as the United States, put on a badge and go to work knowing that they may face extremely dangerous situations, exacerbated by significant economic uncertainties, open border policies, and the raging opioid crisis.

We owe a debt of gratitude to these individuals who risk their lives to enforce the law and protect our communities. Law enforcement officers take time away from their families and their loved ones, often without the thanks that they deserve and often putting themselves in harm's way.

Before I highlight some of our officers who are currently serving the great State of Washington, I would like to ask for a moment of silence for the victims of today's tragic shooting in Richland, Washington, and the officers who are currently investigating that incident.

Trooper David Brandt of the Tri-Cities was selected as the 2020 Washington State Trooper of the Year. Trooper Brandt not only demonstrates a strong commitment to law enforcement, but takes the time to personally connect with his community; from reading books to schoolchildren to conducting safety classes for women to delivering meals to families in need.

King County Trooper Patoc also goes beyond above and beyond the line of duty and just last year saved the life of a man on the brink of committing suicide, who is now receiving the critical help that he requires.

These officers are the kinds of heroes that we need, and they deserve our utmost support and recognition. I also want to recognize some officers whose lives were recently lost.

In just January of this year, we lost Trooper Robert LaMay of Yakima, who served honorably for over two decades. In October of last year, we lost Trooper Detective Eric Gunderson of Tacoma in the line of duty. These and all of our fallen officers will not be forgotten.

I want to personally thank the police and sheriff's departments of Washington State Patrol, and all of the officers who keep central Washington's communities safe. Today and every day we offer our appreciation and respect for law enforcement officers across the Nation.

Madam Speaker, I also want to thank Mrs. CAMMACK, my friend, for putting together this Special Order.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative NEWHOUSE for his comments.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER), a friend and colleague, and a champion for our law enforcement.

Mr. KELLER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for organizing this Special Order, the important things for which we should all be very passionate about.

Defunding the police is not just a Democrat slogan, it is a dangerous policy that has been advocated by some Washington Democrats and is having devastating consequences for the morale and safety of America's law enforcement officers.

In 2021, 346 officers were shot, and ambush-style attacks increased by 115 percent from 2020. Last month, we all watched as NYPD officers lined the streets of Manhattan to honor two of their fallen brothers who were shot and killed in the line of duty.

Criminal acts of violence against law enforcement are becoming all too common. Despite this fact, Washington Democrats continue to call for defunding the police, and stoke division between the public and the heroes who keep us safe every day and sacrifice to do so.

Painting law enforcement out to be the bad guy doesn't make America safer. It does exactly the opposite, and it only serves to embolden more criminal behavior and lawlessness. Our officers protect us every day and they need our support now more than ever.

I stand with law enforcement, and I stand for law and order. I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for having this important Special Order.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I thank Representative KELLER for his comments.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), my friend and colleague.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. Much of the police hatred that we get stems from horribly divisive politicians like President Biden, who claim that Black children must be taught to tolerate racist abuse from police just to make it home.

President Obama also had quotes encouraging police hatred by screaming racism. Let's look at the facts as pointed out by Heather Mac Donald in an excellent article in *The Wall Street Journal*. Sadly, groups who are involved in crime are more likely to get in confrontations with police. Fifty-three percent of homicide offenders in America and 60 percent of robberies are committed by the same demographic that Black Lives Matter purports to help. Study after study after study analyzing the statistics shows no racism.

Other studies show that Black and Brown policemen are more likely to shoot suspects than White officers, also inconsistent with the racial narrative.

You might say why discuss this issue? Who cares if we lie and tear down the police? I suggest that the Congressmen around here all make an effort to do a ride-along with the police. See what great, selfless human beings they are before you scream racism without cause.

Furthermore, police are human, and when you keep calling police racists, I think sometimes police have a tendency to back off and become less assertive. And that is one of the major reasons a big city near me, the city of Milwaukee, for 2 years in a row we have had massive, record numbers of homicides in the city. That is what happens when the police become cowed and less effective.

It has resulted, I think, in dozens of murders in Milwaukee that would not have happened without the racist antipolice groups. And by groups, I point out, not only politicians, but the NFL has encouraged police dislike with their Black Lives Matter support in the stadiums. Stand up to the cheap politicians tearing down the police. Stand up to the billionaires who own the NFL and fan the flames of anti-race feelings, and stand with the police of America who are doing a tremendous job.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from the great State of Wisconsin for his comments.

It is my pleasure to yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE), my friend and a champion for law enforcement.

Mr. CLYDE. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman CAMMACK for yielding.

Madam Speaker, our great Nation is blessed with dedicated law enforcement officers who wake up every morning to maintain law and order, keep communities safe, and answer the call when criminals strike. Yet, their sacrifice has been met with radical calls from the left to defund the police, and also horrific attacks from those people who believe in defunding the police.

In 2021 alone, there were 346 officers shot in the line of duty, including 63 tragic deaths. Additionally, there was almost a 50 percent increase in police officer murders last year, totaling 73 deaths from violent criminals who have no respect for law and order.

These startling statistics represent the highest number of law enforcement officers who were murdered since the terror attacks of September 11, 2001.

□ 2140

This violence isn't just sequestered to major cities either. It is happening all across the United States. Unfortunately, my home district, Georgia's Ninth, a district that is primarily rural, knows this harsh reality all too well.

Back in November of last year, Jackson County, my home county, lost both a mother and a heroic police officer, Deputy Lena Marshall. After responding to a domestic call that escalated to a violent shootout, Deputy Marshall's life was taken while serving to keep Georgians safe.

Any act of criminal violence is an assault on justice, which is why we must provide our brave men and women in blue with the community support, the resources, and especially the political

backing needed to adequately respond to surging crime across our Nation.

Those in political office show both ignorance and cowardice when they side with criminals and, thereby, undermine those who serve and protect.

May God protect our courageous law enforcement officers who put their lives on the line each and every day, and God bless the fallen heroes, like Deputy Marshall, who made the ultimate sacrifice while protecting the communities they serve.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from the great State of Georgia for those words.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MURPHY), my friend and colleague.

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, over the last year, our law enforcement officers have been faced with targeted attacks, skyrocketing crime rates, and decimated budgets.

Madam Speaker, despite these challenges, our law enforcement officers continue to protect and serve our communities with unwavering bravery, sacrifice, and selflessness.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to represent so many incredible law enforcement officers in eastern North Carolina, all of whom put themselves at risk each day so that the rest of us can live in safe, secure communities.

Madam Speaker, Deputy Zachary Bellingham, a former U.S. Marine and deputy for the Craven County Sheriff's Office, in my district, is no exception.

On October 21, 2021, Deputy Bellingham sustained life-threatening injuries while performing a wellness check in New Bern, North Carolina, when he was shot in the line of duty. Following his injuries, he was taken to Carolina East Medical Center, airlifted to Greenville, and received emergency surgery. He was then transferred to Shepherd's Rehabilitation Center in Atlanta, where he has shown strong perseverance in his rehabilitation.

The conduct and actions of Deputy Bellingham embody the values of a true American hero. Madam Speaker, his brave actions on that fateful day highlight the very best of our law enforcement and all they do to protect our communities. I am so relieved to know that Deputy Bellingham is in good care and continuing his road to recovery.

After his injury, members of our community quickly rallied around Deputy Bellingham, offering him well-wishes in support of his recovery.

His service, Madam Speaker, is one we all honor and appreciate, and I am grateful to represent such a compassionate and caring community in eastern North Carolina.

Madam Speaker, please join us in expressing our sincere gratitude to not only this deputy but all law enforcement officers for their commitment to keeping us and our families safe each and every day.



Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), my friend and colleague and a champion of law enforcement.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK), for her leadership in putting together this Special Order this evening to honor our local law enforcement officers. I can think of few people more deserving of this honor than the men and women in local law enforcement, as their daily acts of heroism, bravery, and courage keep our communities safe.

Tonight, we have heard numerous examples of officers displaying acts of heroism while in the line of duty. I would like to include a few more from my district back in Cincinnati, Ohio.

Officers Tiffany Mountjoy and Chris Keene of the Franklin, Ohio, Police Department, ran into a house engulfed in flames, without protective gear, to save the life of an 82-year-old woman who was trapped inside.

Cincinnati Police Officer Sonny Kim was shot and killed in the line of duty by an individual whose apparent motive was to lure and murder as many police officers as possible.

Colerain Township Police Officer Dale Woods was responding to a traffic accident when he was hit by a truck. Officer Woods, a father of three children, who had served the community with distinction for 15 years, died 3 days later.

Finally, one of most heroic occurrences by police officers in my congressional district in recent memory took place a couple of years back when Cincinnati police officers responded to an active shooter situation in downtown Cincinnati at the Fifth Third Bank on Fountain Square. Their quick actions saved the lives of countless civilians who were in the building that day, whose lives probably would have been lost but for their heroism.

According to the FBI, there were 73 law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty last year by felonious homicide, meaning they were killed with firearms, vehicles, knives, or assaults. That is nearly twice as many as were killed in the line of duty the year before. Of those, 32 officers were killed last year by ambush attack, which is twice as many as the previous 2 years combined.

These numbers are quite disturbing, particularly when you consider that many Democrat elected officials across the country, and in this very House, support policies which are antipolice, like defunding the police or dismantling police departments or eliminating qualified immunity, which means they could be sued personally as police officers.

We need to be supporting our police officers all across the country, not implementing policies that put them at risk.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague for being a continual champion for our law enforcement officers.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. OBERNOLTE), my friend and colleague and a champion for law enforcement.

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Madam Speaker, this last year has seen an unprecedented wave of violence against law enforcement officers across our country.

In particular, in my home State of California, 23 law enforcement agents were shot in the line of duty last year. In my own district, the Eighth District of California, one was unfortunately shot and killed by gunfire. That was Sergeant Dominic Vaca of the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department.

Congress needs to work to support and improve our law enforcement agencies, not to defund or dismantle them.

I am committed to protecting our law enforcement agencies and to defending the rule of law across our country and their efforts to keep our community safe.

Madam Speaker, last year, I was proud to host a dinner in honor of 15 of California's Eighth's first responder community who went above and beyond the call of duty last year to serve and protect our community.

Amongst our honorees were San Bernardino County Deputy Sheriff Dustin Whitson, who was shot in the line of duty while responding to a call at a storage facility in Hesperia; California Highway Patrol Inland Division Officer Garret Morris, who helps run an after-school racing team to provide community support and a safe alternative to illegal street racing for kids in our community; San Bernardino County Deputy Sheriff Tiffany Kautz, who was instrumental in obtaining the arrest and conviction of a man who was sexually abusing his own stepchildren; San Bernardino County Probation Corrections Supervisor Gina Martinez, who passed away last September after 21 years of ensuring that each youth in her care obtained a diploma, employment, and a place that they could call home and feel safe.

Madam Speaker, these law enforcement officers are examples of the dedication our first responders show to our community every day, and their stories are echoed by countless law enforcement personnel across our country.

Madam Speaker, it is time that this Congress stands behind our law enforcement officers and the rule of law.

Madam Speaker, I thank each of our law enforcement officers for their dedication to our community.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from the great State of California for continuing to be a champion for our police departments and law enforcement officers.

Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida has 7 minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Madam Speaker, it is pretty challenging to be standing in

a room that, from the view of C-SPAN, is filled. But I can tell you right now that it is just you and me, Madam Speaker, as well as my colleague from the Sunshine State, Representative RUTHERFORD, behind me, as well as some of our fantastic staff here on the House floor.

□ 2150

I think it is time that we stop playing these partisan games and really come together because this truly is a bipartisan issue. This is an issue that affects our communities as a whole, and I think if we are going to call for responsibility, actions, and words, we should start in this Chamber.

I have a quote here that I wanted to read from one of our colleagues. It says: "I am going to make sure that I have security because I know I have had attempts on my life, and I have too much work to do. There are too many people that need help right now. So, if I end up spending \$200,000, if I spend \$10 more on it, you know what? I get to be here to do the work. So suck it up, and defunding the police has to happen. We need to defund the police and put that money into social safety nets because we are trying to save lives." Madam Speaker, those are your words.

See, when I was homeless about a decade ago, I wasn't privileged enough to have \$200,000 to spend on private security. In fact, it was a comfort knowing that at any moment, in some of the toughest situations that were happening around us—violence, abuse—that a quick call to 911 would result in someone coming to help. We had nothing but the reassurance that on the other end of that line, someone was coming to help, someone was willing to answer the call.

I know that there is far more in this country that unites us than divides us, but I cannot tell you how disappointed I am as we have stood here for the last hour reciting stories of heroism, of selflessness—if I had time, I would recite the names of our fallen officers, but I simply haven't enough time. And, quite frankly, Madam Speaker, you haven't even looked up off your phone.

To Americans who are watching this, know that there are people in this Congress who do give a damn, who will look up off their phone, who are not too bothered to listen. We will not stop fighting. We will continue to back the blue.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 314. An act to repeal the Klamath Tribe Judgment Fund Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

S. 559. An act to amend the Grand Ronde Reservation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

## ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 8, 2022, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,  
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-3382. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Annual Information Return/Reports (RIN: 1210-AB97) received February 2, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EC-3383. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedure for Clothes Dryers [EERE-2014-BT-TP-0034] (RIN: 1904-AD46) received February 1, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3384. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Revenue Procedure 2021-53 (RP-119692-21) received February 1, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

EC-3385. A letter from the Director, Legal Processing Division, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Revenue Procedure 2022-10 (RP-105814-21) received February 1, 2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON  
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DEUTCH: Committee on Ethics. In the Matter of Allegations Relating to Representative Jamaal Bowman (Rept. 117-242). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. RASKIN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 912. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3067) to provide stability to and enhance the services of the United States Postal Service, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6617) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes; and for other purposes (Rept. 117-243). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following

titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 6617. A bill making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 6618. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Energy to make awards to cover regulatory costs relating to licensing certain first-of-a-kind advanced nuclear reactors; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. HINSON:

H.R. 6619. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Education from providing Federal funds to a local educational agency unless in-person instruction is available to all students and parents may opt out of student mask mandates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself and Mr. CARTER of Louisiana):

H.R. 6620. A bill to amend title 51, United States Code, to extend the authority of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to enter into leases of non-excess property of the Administration; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. BOEBERT (for herself, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BROOKS, Mrs. MILLER of Illinois, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BUDD, Mr. POSEY, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mrs. GREENE of Georgia):

H.R. 6621. A bill to prevent recipients of Federal funds from providing, or assisting in the provision of, legal representation to aliens unlawfully present in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 6622. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide clarification with respect to the liability of third party payers for medical assistance paid under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself, Mr. MAST, Mr. CLYDE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 6623. A bill to designate the National Museum of the Mighty Eighth Air Force in Pooler, Georgia as the official National Museum of the Mighty Eighth Air Force in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. KEATING, and Mrs. WAGNER):

H.R. 6624. A bill to authorize the Transatlantic Legislators' Dialogue (United States-European Union Interparliamentary Group), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Ms. MALLIOTAKIS, Mr. GARBARINO, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. FEENSTRA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mrs. CAMMACK, Mr. BOST, and Ms. TENNEY):

H.R. 6625. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from issuing guidance intended to restrict access to COVID-19 monoclonal antibody therapies and other treatments; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ELLZEY (for himself, Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. BRADY, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. TONY GONZALES of Texas, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. NEHLS, Mr. PFLUGER, Ms. VAN DUYN, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, and Mr. JACKSON):

H.R. 6626. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3903 Melear Drive in Arlington, Texas, as the "Ron Wright Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. GAETZ:

H.R. 6627. A bill to amend the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to require the application of the administrative and judicial dispute-resolution procedures to registered lobbyists for claims alleging sexual harassment or sexual assault, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia (for himself, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. PERRY, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. BABIN, Mr. MOONEY, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. MOORE of Alabama, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. CAWTHORN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. ROSENDALE, and Mrs. BOEBERT):

H.R. 6628. A bill to provide appropriations for a border wall and provide for a moratorium on certain other funding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. HINSON, and Mr. SCHRADER):

H.R. 6629. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to require the Congressional Budget Office to provide an inflation estimate with respect to legislation with a significant impact on the Gross Domestic Product of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. KIM of California:

H.R. 6630. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1400 N Kraemer Blvd. in Placentia, California, as the "PFC Jang Ho Kim Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mrs. KIM of California:

H.R. 6631. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4770 Eureka Ave in Yorba Linda, California, as the "Cottle Centanni Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. KUSTOFF:

H.R. 6632. A bill to except quotations of fixed-income securities from certain regulatory requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MAST (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. MANN, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. PERRY, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. MCCLAIN, Mr. ROSENDALE, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. CLOUD, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina, Mr. LONG, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 6633. A bill to direct the Secretary concerned to reinstate a member involuntarily separated from the Armed Forces solely on the basis of the refusal of such member to receive a vaccination against COVID-19; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SCHRIER (for herself and Mr. HUDSON):

H.R. 6634. A bill to amend title XXVIII of the Public Health Service Act to eliminate the sunset of authority to make certain appointments for National Disaster Medical System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 6635. A bill to amend the Act commonly known as the Wild Free-roaming Horses and Burros Act to prohibit certain uses of aircraft with respect to the management of wild free-roaming horses and burros, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TRONE (for himself, Mr. EMMER, Mr. TURNER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. BACON, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mrs. BEATTY):

H.R. 6636. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to remove the Medicaid coverage exclusion for inmates in custody pending disposition of charges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ (for herself, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. GALLEGO, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. TRONE, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. BOWMAN, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.J. Res. 70. A joint resolution expressing support for designation of the week of February 7, 2022, through February 11, 2022, as "National School Counseling Week"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself and Mr. HILL):

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution condemning threats of violence against historically Black colleges and universities ("HBCUs") and reaffirming support for HBCUs and their students; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H. Res. 913. A resolution expressing support for the designation of February 6 to 12, 2022, as "National Burn Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 6617.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states:

"No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law. . . ."

In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides:

"The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ."

Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 6618.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mrs. HINSON:

H.R. 6619.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 6620.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. BOEBERT:

H.R. 6621.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 The laws of each state ought, and must, govern within its jurisdiction; and the laws and usages of one state cannot be permitted to prescribe qualifications for citizens, to be claimed and exercised in other states, in contravention to their local policy.

By Mr. BURGESS:

H.R. 6622.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 6623.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. COSTA:

H.R. 6624.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 6625.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment XIV Section 1.

All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, lib-

erty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

By Mr. ELLZEY:

H.R. 6626.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which states "[t]he Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States".

By Mr. GAETZ:

H.R. 6627.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia:

H.R. 6628.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 6629.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mrs. KIM of California:

H.R. 6630.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. KIM of California:

H.R. 6631.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. KUSTOFF:

H.R. 6632.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

By Mr. MAST:

H.R. 6633.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. SCHRIER:

H.R. 6634.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Ms. TITUS:

H.R. 6635.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, and Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TRONE:

H.R. 6636.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. SÁNCHEZ:

H.J. Res. 70.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 222: Ms. SPEIER.  
H.R. 263: Ms. JACKSON LEE.  
H.R. 336: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota and Mr. TAKANO.  
H.R. 475: Mr. MCCAUL.  
H.R. 542: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.  
H.R. 622: Mr. AGUILAR.  
H.R. 675: Ms. MENG and Mr. EVANS.  
H.R. 748: Mr. COSTA.  
H.R. 756: Mr. FALLON.  
H.R. 971: Mr. QUIGLEY.  
H.R. 1095: Ms. PELOSI.  
H.R. 1179: Ms. BONAMICI.  
H.R. 1226: Ms. JACKSON LEE.  
H.R. 1275: Mr. BENTZ, Mr. TAYLOR, and Mr. ELLZEY.  
H.R. 1297: Mr. MCCAUL.  
H.R. 1368: Mr. CLEAVER.  
H.R. 1466: Mr. PAPPAS.  
H.R. 1522: Mr. REED.  
H.R. 1551: Mr. VEASEY.  
H.R. 1577: Mrs. TRAHAN.  
H.R. 1735: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.  
H.R. 1755: Ms. PORTER.  
H.R. 2046: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GARBARINO, Ms. VAN DUYN, and Mr. BURGESS.  
H.R. 2082: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.  
H.R. 2192: Mr. MRVAN.  
H.R. 2216: Ms. BOURDEAUX.  
H.R. 2250: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.  
H.R. 2271: Ms. ROSS and Mr. COLE.  
H.R. 2503: Mrs. MCBATH.  
H.R. 2542: Mr. JONES.  
H.R. 2638: Mr. KAHELE.  
H.R. 2803: Ms. STANSBURY.  
H.R. 2879: Mr. GOSAR.  
H.R. 2985: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.  
H.R. 3079: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. NORMAN.  
H.R. 3083: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mrs. BICE of Oklahoma.  
H.R. 3087: Mr. YARMOUTH.  
H.R. 3165: Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. TLAI, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.  
H.R. 3225: Mr. LEVIN of California.  
H.R. 3348: Ms. CHU and Mrs. KIM of California.  
H.R. 3445: Mr. VARGAS.  
H.R. 3488: Ms. DELAULO, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mr. MRVAN.  
H.R. 3548: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.  
H.R. 3577: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, and Mr. ROSE.  
H.R. 3630: Mrs. CAMMACK and Mr. OWENS.  
H.R. 3650: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.  
H.R. 3783: Mr. BOWMAN and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.  
H.R. 3807: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.  
H.R. 3829: Mr. CALVERT.  
H.R. 3860: Ms. TENNEY.  
H.R. 3896: Mr. BAIRD.  
H.R. 3897: Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina.  
H.R. 4006: Mr. PANETTA.  
H.R. 4077: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.  
H.R. 4134: Ms. ROSS and Ms. JACOBS of California.  
H.R. 4141: Mr. QUIGLEY.  
H.R. 4390: Mr. ROSE.  
H.R. 4442: Mr. QUIGLEY and Ms. STANSBURY.  
H.R. 4454: Mr. HUFFMAN.  
H.R. 4479: Mrs. TRAHAN.  
H.R. 4485: Mr. BAIRD.  
H.R. 4624: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.  
H.R. 4642: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 4702: Mr. WALBERG.  
H.R. 4750: Mr. QUIGLEY.  
H.R. 4801: Mr. CARSON.  
H.R. 4803: Mr. PANETTA.  
H.R. 4817: Ms. BARRAGÁN.  
H.R. 4821: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mrs. KIM of California.  
H.R. 4826: Ms. LOFGREN.  
H.R. 4828: Mr. STEIL.  
H.R. 4871: Mr. BROWN of Maryland and Mr. TONKO.  
H.R. 4949: Mr. COSTA and Mr. POSEY.  
H.R. 5035: Mr. TRONE.  
H.R. 5056: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
H.R. 5145: Ms. STRICKLAND.  
H.R. 5232: Ms. CRAIG.  
H.R. 5370: Ms. DELBENE.  
H.R. 5421: Mr. CARSON.  
H.R. 5444: Mr. CLEAVER.  
H.R. 5471: Mr. SIMPSON.  
H.R. 5533: Mr. BEYER and Ms. LOFGREN.  
H.R. 5536: Mr. LAMB, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.  
H.R. 5590: Mr. CALVERT.  
H.R. 5721: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.  
H.R. 5724: Ms. MENG.  
H.R. 5727: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. SABLAN.  
H.R. 5735: Ms. JAYAPAL, Mrs. HARTZLER, and Mr. AGUILAR.  
H.R. 5742: Mr. AGUILAR.  
H.R. 5776: Ms. BARRAGÁN.  
H.R. 5809: Mr. LIEU and Mr. RUIZ.  
H.R. 6006: Mr. STEIL.  
H.R. 6064: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS.  
H.R. 6094: Ms. BARRAGÁN.  
H.R. 6100: Mr. CICILLINE.  
H.R. 6117: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER and Mr. KILDEE.  
H.R. 6132: Mr. GOODEN of Texas and Ms. HERRELL.  
H.R. 6161: Mr. MCHENRY.  
H.R. 6181: Ms. STRICKLAND.  
H.R. 6184: Mr. MEUSER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. BOST, and Mr. BARR.  
H.R. 6201: Mr. ADERHOLT.  
H.R. 6239: Mr. MCCAUL.  
H.R. 6267: Ms. STEFANIK.  
H.R. 6273: Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS and Mr. MRVAN.  
H.R. 6276: Ms. ESHOO.  
H.R. 6406: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas and Mr. COLE.  
H.R. 6422: Mrs. LESKO and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.  
H.R. 6448: Ms. HOULAHAN.  
H.R. 6482: Mr. HUDSON and Ms. ROSS.  
H.R. 6495: Mr. ROSE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. OBERNOLTE, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. LATTI.  
H.R. 6502: Mr. HARRIS.  
H.R. 6523: Mr. CALVERT.  
H.R. 6531: Ms. LEE of California and Mr. COHEN.  
H.R. 6536: Mr. BANKS and Mr. JACKSON.  
H.R. 6546: Mr. CARSON.  
H.R. 6557: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GARCÍA of ILLINOIS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 6558: Mr. JACKSON.  
H.R. 6559: Mr. CARSON.  
H.R. 6572: Mr. BACON and Mr. COLE.  
H.R. 6577: Mr. CORREA.  
H.R. 6578: Mr. BACON.  
H.R. 6580: Ms. JAYAPAL.  
H.R. 6592: Mr. BAIRD.  
H.R. 6597: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. GOTTHEIMER.  
H.R. 6602: Mr. PETERS.  
H.R. 6612: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Ms. STANSBURY.  
H.J. Res. 53: Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. CLYBURN.

H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. HICE of Georgia.  
H. Con. Res. 65: Mrs. BUSTOS.  
H. Res. 290: Ms. PINGREE.  
H. Res. 704: Mr. TONKO, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.  
H. Res. 741: Mr. MRVAN.  
H. Res. 833: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. COHEN.  
H. Res. 878: Mr. CORREA.  
H. Res. 881: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. STEIL, Mr. POCAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. MANN, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. TORRES of New York, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. OMAR, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. EVANS, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.  
H. Res. 884: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas and Mr. CICILLINE.  
H. Res. 888: Mr. TONKO, Mr. BALDERSON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LAMB, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. TITUS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. JONES, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. QUIGLEY.  
H. Res. 891: Mr. BEYER.  
H. Res. 892: Mr. ISSA, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. LIEU, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. SIRES, Mr. MALINOWSKI, and Mr. COHEN.  
H. Res. 895: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. RUPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. WILD, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. SIRES, Mr. KEATING, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mr. RASKIN.  
H. Res. 896: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. SWALWELL.  
H. Res. 907: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

### CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

#### OFFERED BY Ms. DELAULO

H.R. 6617, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes, does not contain any congressional earmark, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

#### OFFERED BY Mr. YARMOUTH

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 6617 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative CAROLYN MALONEY or a designee to H.R. 3076, the Postal Service Reform Act, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.